ORIENTAL TRANSLATION FUND

NEW SERIES

VOL. XVIII

THE

ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA

WITH AN APPENDIX

ON THE

MAHĀVRATA

BY

ARTHUR BERRIEDALE KEITH, M.A., B.C.L.

Of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, and of the Colonial Office

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

AND SOLD AT

22, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON

1908

CONTENTS.

PREFACE.

THOUGH MSS. of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka have for many years been available in Europe, that text as a whole has been unfortunate in remaining unedited, probably owing to the fact that most of it is not of special importance or originality, and that the part of greatest value and interest, the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, was published as long ago as 1861 by the late Professor Cowell in the *Bibliotheca Indica*. It forms, however, in many respects a close parallel to, and commentary on, the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, and I have thought it desirable to complete my edition and translation of that work by a literal rendering of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.

I am aware that in several places my version is unsatisfactory, and I should have preferred if I could have found it possible to obtain further manuscript material for the constitution of the text of Adhyāyas vii–xv. But I am inclined to think that it is important in Sanskrit studies to observe some proportion between the effort expended and the value of the result, and I trust that this translation will afford students of the Veda a means of seeing, with the least expenditure of time and trouble, exactly what the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka contains. A full comparison with the Aitareya Āraṇyaka will be found in my edition of the latter work, in the Indexes to which I have included the lexicographical and other matter of the Śāṅkhāyana so fully as to render an Index to this translation needless.

I have added, as of more general interest, an Appendix on the Mahāvrata rite. This paper was prepared for the recent

meeting of the Congress of Religions at Oxford, which I was unavoidably prevented from attending, but at which Professor Macdonell very kindly read an abstract of the paper.

I have to express my heartiest thanks to the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society for accepting this translation for their series, and to Miss Hughes for the great trouble she has been so good as to take to secure its satisfactory production and to remove errors. Professor Eggeling, under whom I commenced to learn Sanskrit, has done me the honour of reading a proof and of making suggestions which I have been only too glad to accept.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

London, September, 1908.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Mahāvrata in the form described in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka is the ceremonial performed on the second last day of the Gavāmayana Sattra, a sacrifice extending over a year and symbolic of the year. As a form of the Agniṣṭoma the ritual feature of the day is its division into three parts, the morning, midday, and evening pressings of the Soma and their accompanying Stotras of the Sāman singers and Śastras of the Hotṛs. The Śastras alone are systematically dealt with in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, though mention is made also of the corresponding Stotras. In the morning pressing there correspond to the Bahiṣpavamāna and to four Ajya Stotras the Ājya and Praüga Śastras of the Hotṛ and three Ājya Śastras of the Hotrakas. In the midday pressing there correspond to the Mādhyandinapavamāna Stotra and four Pṛṣṭha Stotras the Marutvatīya and Niṣkevalya Sastras of the Hotṛ and three Niṣkevalya Śastras of the Hotrakas. In the evening pressing there correspond to the Ārbhavapavamāna Stotra and the Yajñāyajñīya Sāman the Vaiśvadeva and Āgnimāruta Śastras.

These Śastras receive, however, very different shares of the attention of the writer of the Āraṇyaka, i and ii. After an introduction (i, 1) he devotes a single chapter to the Ājya and Praüga Śastras (i, 2), and one to the Marutvatīya Śastra (i, 3). He then describes and explains the ceremonies preceding immediately the Niṣkevalya Śastra or Mahad Uktha, which forms the essential and highest part of the ritual, commencing with the oblations of ghee (i, 4; 5), interpolating a legend of Viśvāmitra (i, 6), and concluding with the ceremonial of the mounting of the swing (i, 7; 8), which symbolizes the sun. The Mahad Uktha itself, in its full

detail, occupies nearly all the second book (ii, 1–17), and a concluding chapter (ii, 18) deals with the Vaiśvadeva and Āgnimāruta Sastras.

The Āraṇyaka does not go into any detailed explanation of the ceremonies alluded to in i, 4; 5; 7; 8, and to understand the allusions it is necessary to refer to Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii and xviii, of which a brief summary follows.

Preparations for the ceremony are commenced some days before it begins. For making a swing for the Hotṛ there are brought together two or three planks, preferably of Udumbara wood, an arm[1] thick, an ell long, pierced at the corners; also two forked poles of over a man's height, a cross-bar and strong cords of Muñja grass, more than two fathoms long. For the Udgātṛ's seat Muñja or Darbha grass is used, and the feet are a span high, the other parts an ell. The Adhvaryu is given a bundle of Muñja or Kuśa grass, on which he stands and makes his responses. The other priests have only *bṛsīs* (mats) a span high. A lute with a hundred strings is got ready, the body of Palāśa, the handle of Udumbara wood, or *vice versa*; it is covered with a red ox-hide, hairy side upmost, and as bow a naturally crooked reed with leaves is used. For the maidens who are to dance water-jugs are provided, and there is a variety of musical instruments[2] which are merely names to us. There are also four or six drums, two within and two without the Sadas. A horse and chariot are ready and a bow and three arrows for use by a king or other distinguished archer. The target consists of an entirely round skin hung up between two posts to the left of the Āgnīdhra. Behind the Āgnīdhra a hole is dug and covered with the skin of the sacrificial animal, which serves as the so-called 'earth-drum,' which is beaten with the tail of the sacrificial animal. The presence of a Śūdra woman and an Āryan 'bald head' is mentioned as antiquated and obsolete.[3]

[1] None of these measures can be fixed with certainty; cf. Hopkins on Epic Measures, *J.A.O.S.*, xxiii, 147 seq.; *Z.D.M.G.*, lvi, 347.

[2] *Avaghaṭarikā, alābuvīṇā, ghāṭakarkarī, godhāvīṇākā, kāṇḍavīṇā, picchorā*, etc. Cf. the list in Sāyaṇa's comm. on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 5, quoted from Āpastamba.

[3] Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 1–6.

In the evening before the rite begins, as usual, the place of the sacrifice is swept, fresh grass strewed, etc., and at night begins the Prātaranuvāka litany, which has to be composed of a full thousand verses. An animal sacrifice is performed, either of one beast for Indra and Agni or of eleven,[1] and in addition the beasts mentioned in the Āraṇyaka, i, 1. The utensils are, after the sacrifice is completed, carefully washed outside the Vedi and brought within the Sadas after the Saṃprasarpaṇa, or 'gliding in,' of the celebrants is completed. No peculiarities occur in the ritual which follows the Agniṣṭoma[2] until after the Marutvatīya Śastra,[3] or just after the ending of the morning pressing, when the setting up of the swing takes place. Holes[4] have to be dug, and the side-posts and the cross-bars are carpentered. The cross-beam is placed as high as the Hotṛ's forehead, or, if he is small, extended arms. The posts are rammed hard into the ground, and made secure by pressing in twigs, etc., and the swing seat is fastened firmly with the ropes, so as to be a span above the earth. Grass is strewed under it, and the right side may be a little elevated.

After the Māhendragrahas have been drawn off, the Adhvaryu goes in front of the Hotṛ's altar, and the Hotṛ then addresses to him the Praiṣa, 'Adhvaryu, now cease.' Then the Hotṛ leaves the Sadas, goes round the Āgnīdhra's altar, and, bending the right knee, takes with a ladle of Udumbara wood eight libations of ghee (i, 4), which he offers to the accompaniment of a Mantra apiece. He puts down the ladle, and, leaving the vicinity of the Āgnīdhra, stands in front of the Sadas[5] to the north of the Sruti, facing the east, and mutters the Parimāds (i, 4; 5). Then[6] he pays reverence to the fire altar

[1] Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 7, 7.

[2] Now most fully and admirably described by Caland & Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, Paris, 1906, 1907.

[3] For the morning Śastras and the Marutvatīya, see Śāṅkhāyana, xvii, 8; 9.

[4] Ibid., xvii, 10–12, 5.

[5] See plan in Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xxvi, followed in *L'Agniṣṭoma*.

[6] Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 12, 6–15, 12. Other accounts of the ritual are given in Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, iii, 10–iv, 3; Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xiii, 3; Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, v, 5, 6; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vii, 5, 9; 10; Brāhmaṇa, i, 2, 6, 7; Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v. See Hillebrandt, *Rom. Forsch.*, v, 299 seq.; below, pp. 73 seq.

in its several parts, and to the sun while in the sacrificial hut (i, 5). The Hotṛ then retires into the Sadas, goes behind the swing which is there, and takes hold of it, not again to let it go until he has mounted on and descended from it. He gives to the Adhvaryu instructions as to the exact mode of making responses, and to the Prastotṛ as to leaving out seven Stotriyas. The Adhvaryu begins the Mahāvrata Sāman, the Udgātṛ mounts his Udumbara stool, and the other priests sit on their mats. The Udgātṛ beats the big lute and the women their lutes. The drums, including the 'earth-drum' are beaten, and loud cries raised. Maids with water-pitchers on their heads dance thrice to the left, round the Mārjālīya altar, singing 'Oh, this is sweet, this is sweet!' and then thrice to the right in silence. The horse is yoked to the chariot on the right side of the Vedi, and an armed warrior, or the king, mounts, and, taking the bow and three arrows, encircles the Vedi to the right, piercing as he does so with his arrows the target, so that, however, the arrows remain fixed in the hide. Then the horse is unyoked. The Prastotṛ, if seven Stotriyas of the Stotra still remain, then signals to the Hotṛ with the words *ā velā:* The Hotṛ thereafter drags the seat of the swing towards him, and thrice breathes out and thrice in (i, 6 fin.). The Mantras at the end of i, 5, are spoken just before this,[1] when he touches simultaneously with his right hand the earth and the seat of the swing, when he lays his hand on the swing, and when he holds it in the air a span above the seat of the swing. After touching the swing with his breast alternately on the right and left sides, the Hotṛ slides over, stretches out his feet in front of him on the earth, and again breathes out and breathes in. He sits down, making a lap, on the swing seat, and with his right hand he touches the back part of the swing, repeating during the first Pratihāra a Mantra, and then breathes out and in. At the end of the Stotra the drums, including the earth-drum, are split up, all noise ceases, the dancing maids put down their jars on the Mārjālīya altar,

[1] Comm. on Śāṅkhāyana, xvii, 15, 10–12; in 15, 13, the action of the Hotṛ as regards the swing is dealt with, there being, of course, nothing to correspond with the Āraṇyaka, i, 6, as a whole.

and go away. The Prastotṛ, with the word *eṣā*, urges the Hotṛ to begin the Niṣkevalya Śastra. The Hotṛ then utters after the last Pratihāra the Āhāva, *adhvaryo śoṃsāvo3m.*[1]

The Śrauta Sūtras proceed, in book xviii, to give in detail the composition of the several parts of the Mahad Uktha. These details will be found abstracted in the notes to my edition of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka and need not be repeated here.

The Mahāvrata section is followed by the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad,[2] forming books iii–vi of the Āraṇyaka. The first book deals in a confused fashion with the fate of the soul after death, apparently attempting to reconcile the double version of the fate of the dead presented in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads.[3] The second is an exposition of the pre-eminence of Prāṇa as the truth of the universe, but is mainly devoted to showing the practical and quasi-magical uses of the conception. The third is more philosophical, and identifies the real with the inner self, the subject. In the fourth there is a later and more elaborate version of the questioning of Ajātaśatru by Bālāki[4] found in the Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad.

Then follows the Saṃhitā Upaniṣad (books vii and viii), treating of the symbolism of the Saṃhitā, Pada, and Krama texts of the Ṛgveda. Then an Upaniṣad (book ix) dealing with the rivalry of the Prāṇas, one of the commonest of Upaniṣad topics. In the following book (x) the internal Agnihotra is minutely described as a substitute for the formal sacrifice; the next book (xi) contains a brief account of the Prāṇa-saṃvāda, presages of death, and a set of spells. In book xii

[1] Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 16; 17. On *śoṃsāvo3m*, cf. *L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 232.

[2] Ed. and trans. by Cowell, *Bibl. Ind.*, 1861; ed. as one of 32 Upaniṣads in Ānandāśrama series, 1895; trans. by Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, i (2nd ed., 1900); de Harlez, Louvain, 1887; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda*, 1897, pp. 21–58. I follow in my version the recension adopted by Cowell, noting all variants which make the sense different. The Upaniṣad is analysed after Anquetil du Perron's version and a Chambers MS. by Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 392–420. As usual, Anquetil's version is now of no real service.

[3] Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, pp. 336, 337.

[4] Ibid., pp. 87, 88. Four new definitions are added to the original twelve.

is a hymn, or rather spell, addressed to an amulet of Bilva. Book xiii reverts, in a series of quotations inaccurately attributed and cited, to the pre-eminence of the self; book xiv insists on the need of knowing the meaning of the Veda, and book xv contains the Vaṃśa.[1]

For books i and ii the translation follows the text of Dr. W. F. Friedländer (Berlin, 1900), for iii–vi that of Cowell, for vii–xv that published by myself. Occasional reference is made to two MSS., the Berlin,[2] MS. Orient. fol. 630 (ff. 82, dated Saṃvat 1734 (= A.D. 1677), at Rājapura, but many pages injured by water and imperfectly restored), and the Bodleian,[3] MS. Sansk. e. 2. Both of these are excellent MSS., and in most places correct each other's deficiencies. I have derived much benefit from the translations of the Upaniṣads, especially from Cowell's version, a very remarkable piece of work for so early a date, and from Dr. Friedländer's rendering of book i. Of native commentaries I have only seen that of Śaṅkarānanda on the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad,[4] which is a fair interpretation of the text, but contains many blunders. The Upaniṣad is also paraphrased in part by Vidyāraṇya[5] in his Sarvopaniṣadarthānubhūtiprakāśa, of which the eighth and ninth chapters, corresponding to the fifth and sixth books of the Āraṇyaka, are printed in Cowell's edition, and follow the version adopted by Śaṅkarānanda. This is probably explained by the fact that Śaṅkarānanda is described as the teacher of Mādhavācārya[6]

[1] For further details, see my article, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 363–88, which deals also with the probable date of the several parts of the Āraṇyaka. The relations of the Āraṇyaka to the Aitareya Āraṇyaka are fully discussed in my edition of the latter (pp. 30 seq., and in the explanatory notes), in which will also be found an index of the proper names of the Śāṅkhāyana, the text of and a very full index to Adhyāyas vii–xv, and a full index to Adhyāyas i and ii. Jacob's *Concordance* includes the Upaniṣad. For the relation of the Āraṇyaka and Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, see my note, *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 410–12; Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xliv, pp. xliv seq.

[2] Weber, *Berlin Catal.*, ii, 5, 6. The MS. was very kindly lent to me by the Royal Library, through the India Office, by Prof. Pischel's suggestion.

[3] Winternitz & Keith, *Bodl. Catal.*, p. 60.

[4] In Cowell's edition; cf. Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, i, p. c.

[5] That is, Mādhava; see Klemm, *Gurupūjākaumudī*, pp. 41 seq.

[6] Hall, *Bibliogr. Ind.*, p. 98; Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, i, p. c; Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 29.

and pupil of Ānandātma.[1] The version of the Upaniṣad given by these authors prevailed in the south,[2] but its inferior validity is shown by the fact that Śaṅkara[3] followed the other text. Rāmatīrtha on Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, iii, 2, quotes v, 8, from the ordinary version, and the upper limit of age for Śaṅkarānanda's version is uncertain.

A word may be said in conclusion on the philosophic merit of the Upaniṣad. Its contribution to thought lies in v, 5–8, where the unity of consciousness, the interdependence of the organs of sense, the activity of sense, and the objects of sense, and their unity in consciousness are expressed with some clearness and detail. Such passages in truth represent the highest doctrine of the Upaniṣads; the further step which identifies this unity with the Brahman and finds the macrocosm in the microcosm is conceived rather religiously or mystically than philosophically, nor is any attempt made to prove it, while the unity of consciousness is established by tolerable arguments. No doubt the Upaniṣad stands on a much lower plane of thought than the Theætetus or Parmenides, or the de Animâ, and the ideas of Plato and Aristotle are infinitely more subtle and complicated; but the fact remains that the Upaniṣad—probably of earlier date—does deal with a philosophic problem in a philosophic spirit, however much that spirit may be confused by mythology. It should be noted that this section is of Brāhmaṇic origin, and that the speculations of Citra in iii deal with pure mythology in the doctrine of the paths after death, a fact which led Max Müller to ascribe to the Kṣatriyas a special interest in this unphilosophical topic, and scarcely speaks well for their theoretical devotion to pure knowledge as against ritual.

[1] Hall, p. 116; Winternitz & Keith, *Bodl. Catal.*, p. 75.

[2] In the Telugu edition, Madras, 1883, of 108 Upaniṣads, there is no Kauṣītaki (cf. Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, pp. 533, 534), but it is included in a collection of 129 Upaniṣads known to the Āndhrika Brāhmaṇas, made in 1850–1, in Teliṅgana, by Sir Walter Elliot, Eggeling, *India Office Catal.*, p. 122, and agrees with Śaṅkarānanda's recension. Anquetil usually follows it, Cowell, p. viii.

[3] Cowell, p. 5. Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 28, gives the references to Bādarāyaṇa's Sūtra.

The text of the Āraṇyaka is on the whole in a satisfactory condition. The exceptions to the rule are mainly in the case of forms whose meaning is obvious, but which contradict established grammatical rules.[1] It is obvious that the tradition was unable to discriminate between Vedic forms and mere textual blunders, and no reasonable scholarship will hesitate to amend all the forms given by Cowell as 'strange solecisms which sometimes half remind us of the gāthās of the Lalita Vistara' from the Upaniṣad, though the mode of emendation may be doubtful. In other cases it is uncertain whether we have a rare usage or a text error. For example, in iv, 7, we have it said of Sarvajit Kauṣītaki, *yad ahorātrābhyāṃ pāpam akarot saṃ tad vṛṅkte*, where the imperfect [2] stands in a curious relation to the present, here probably historical.[3] Or again, in iii, 4, Saṅkarānanda reads *dhunute vā*, where *vā* cannot be ignored as it is by Max Müller and Deussen. He renders it *aśvā iva romāṇi kampanena*, and Cowell regards this as possible. Yet it is hardly possible to doubt that it is a mere transposition of *dhunuvāte*, actually read in some MSS., and that again an error for *dhunvāte*, the verb being intransitive. Or again, in vi, 2; 3, we cannot accept a masculine nominative *bṛhat*, or in iv, 4, *abhi vātāt* (Berlin MS.), etc. On the other hand, genuine archaisms exist, e.g., *svapnyayā* in vi, 15, *yajūdaraḥ* in a Ṛc in iii, 7, and in several other cases the evidence for hyper-Sandhi is convincing; e.g. iii, 5, where *udgīthopa(ra)śrayaḥ* must represent *udgītha upa°*. Or again, in vii, 2; viii, 1, the genitive *asya* is remarkable,[4] but certain, and may perhaps be compared with *atha·mahāvratasya*, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 1, though there the following words can be

[1] Viz., *niṣiñca* in iii, 2 (*siṣiñca* or *siṣikta*); *praiti* (read *pūrvā prajā* for *pūrvāḥ prajāḥ*) in iv, 8; 10; *saṃveśyan* (*saṃviśyan* or *saṃvekṣyan*) in iv, 10; *veti* (*vyeti*) in v, 1; *adūḍham* (*udūḷham* or *adūduhat*) in v, 5, etc.

[2] Cf. the curious use of *ajayat* in Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, iv, 3, 1, discussed by Delbrück, *Festgruss an Böhtlingk*, p. 25, and *Synt. Forsch.*, ii, 89 seq.; v, 279, 577, 586.

[3] This use of the historical present is doubtful, cf. Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, ii, 90; v, 278; and it may here be the true present, Sarvajit Kauṣītaki being alive, which is of course quite possible; then *akarot* becomes even more difficult.

[4] Cf. the gen. with *vid*, *Synt. Forsch.*, v, 159; Caland, *Altind. Zauberritual*, p. 18, n. 2.

more easily construed with the genitive. In iv, 8, the accusative with *man*, the subjects being the same, is against the Vedic use[1] observed in vii, 8 seq., but occurs in a Ṛc. The secondary character of ix, 7, is shown by the genitive with *brū*,[2] and of viii, 11, by the use *yo 'tra vicikitset saṇakāram eva brūyād ṛte ṇakāram iti*, where the usual Brāhmaṇa construction requires the first person, as in i, 1; ii, 17; viii, 6, and in the parallel Aitareya version.[3] So in viii, 1, and xi, 8, *tsariṇīr* and *Sāvitrīr* present apparent feminine nominatives in *s*, which may be pseudo-antiquities or merely errors of the text, as is suggested by the fact that the former word is very variously read in the parallel passages and the latter occurs only in one of the MSS., the other having the correct form.[4] In viii, 9, the MSS. agree in reading the accusative *paraṃ*, which is quite impossible, and so forth.

[1] *Synt. Forsch.*, v, 104, 179.
[2] Ibid., p. 162.
[3] Cf. Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, ii, 1, 11; *yo vai kāmayetānnādaḥ syād iti.*
[4] Cf. *śabalīs* in Taittirīya Saṃhitā, iv, 3, 11, 5, but *śabalī* in Kāthaka Saṃhitā, xxxix, 10; *ghāṭakarkarīr* in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 3, 12; *ghāṭarīr*, ibid., 15.

THE SANKHAYANA ARANYAKA.

Adhyāya I.

PRAJĀPATI is the year;[1] the Mahāvrata is his body; therefore one should not recite it for another, lest one place in that other the body of all beings. Again, the Mahāvrata is the body of Indra; therefore one should not recite it for another, lest one place in that other the body of Indra. Again, the Mahāvrata is the body[2] of the man, composed of Ṛc, Yajus, and Sāman verses, whom they make ready; therefore one should not recite it for another, lest one place in that other the body of all the metres. One may, however, recite it (for another) as Hotṛ priest of Sattrins or for one's father or teacher.[3] For in that case the recitation is really for himself, and by his own self he perfects[4] the sacrifice. The Stoma of the Mahāvrata is of twenty-five parts. Twenty-four, indeed, are the half-months of the year, so that the year is made up. Again, Prajāpati, the year, is of twenty-five parts. Twenty-four parts are placed at the beginning, and the end is the twenty-fifth.[5] A bull is to be offered to Indra and a goat to Prajāpati. That day, indeed, is Indra's; Indra is Prajāpati. (The goat) is the symbol of Prajāpati. Again, among animals the bull is the symbol of Indra. (1.)

The Ājya Śastra of the Mahāvrata is the twelve-verse hymn,[6] 'The guest of every man.' Twelve, indeed, are the months

[1] See Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xliii, p. xxiii.
[2] This confirms the view of the comm. on Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 2, 1, that in this school the litany is regarded as of human shape. For the idea, cf. iv, 6, and note.
[3] In the two latter cases the Mahāvrata must be part, not of a Sattra, but of an Āhīna or Ekāha, see note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 3, 3; i, 8, *infra*, rather contradicts this by recognising a friend also.
[4] *Samardhayati* approaches the sense 'unites' here, and in some passages of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. The translation adopted is Prof. Eggeling's.
[5] A reference to the Caturviṃśa, which is *de facto* the first day of the Gavāmayana, Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xix, 8. For the Ātman as 25, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, v, 375, n.; Garbe, *Sāṃkhya Philosophie*, p. 16.
[6] RV., viii, 74, 1-12 (vv. 13-15 are a Dānastuti and so not used).

in the year; so the year is made up. In this hymn there are two metres, Gāyatrī and Anuṣṭubh. In the recitation one adds the twenty-five-verse hymn,[1] 'Agni, from fire-sticks, men with devotion.' For the Stoma is of twenty-five parts, and the Sastra is perfect in form when it corresponds with the Stoma. In this hymn there are two metres, Virāj and Triṣṭubh. These make up four (metres). This all,[2] indeed, is fourfold, so that all this is made up. The Praüga Sastra is in Triṣṭubh. The Triṣṭubh is the metre of Indra, and so he is united with his own metre. The (Tṛca [3]), 'Were not they, who were magnified by praise,' is addressed to Vāyu, and contains the words 'great' and 'magnify.' It contains the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great' (Mahā-vrata). The following Tṛca,[4] 'As far as the strength of the body, as far as might,' is addressed to Indra and Vāyu, because (of the expression) 'As far as men perceiving with vision.' 'The fair eye of you two, Varuṇa,' is (the Tṛca [5]) addressed to Mitra and Varuṇa, because (of the expression) 'The sun goes extending (the light) of the two gods.' 'Who will hear, who of those who merit worship,' is (the Tṛca [6]) addressed to the Aśvins, because (of the expression) 'Whom the daughter of the sun chose.' 'How, what priest's (sacrifice) has the great one magnified,' is (the Tṛca [7]) addressed to Indra, and contains the words 'great' and 'magnify.' It contains the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' 'Who is of you a protector, Vasus, who of you a guardian,' is (the Tṛca [8]) addressed to the All-gods, because of the expression 'Varuṇa, Mitra, from the stronger mortal.' 'May this

[1] RV., vii, 1.
[2] Cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, ii, 1; xix, 4; xxviii, 7.
[3] RV., vii, 91, 1–3. The statement that the words 'great' and 'magnified' are contained is not correct as regards the former, but the correctness of the version seems clear from ii, 7; 8, though but for the parallels one might render 'has the word "great," having the word "magnified" = having the word "great."'
[4] R.V., vii, 91, 4–6. The reasons given are only, I think, for the attribution to the deities, who correspond to those of the original Praüga, and it is not sought—as Friedländer, p. 32, n. 3, thinks—to prove that each verse has an equivalent of 'great.'
[5] RV., vii, 61, 1–3.
[6] RV., iv, 43, 1–3.
[7] RV., iv, 23, 1–3. Cf. for the Praüga, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 1, 1.
[8] RV., iv, 55, 1–3.

Sarasvatī, glad,' is (the Tṛca [1]) addressed to Sarasvatī, because of the expression 'He has opened the doors of Ṛta, O happy one.' This is the Praüga Śastra of Vāmadeva, arranged in Tṛcas in Triṣṭubhs, and containing the word 'Ka.' [2] Prajāpati, indeed, is Vāmadeva; in Prajāpati so do they obtain all desires.

Others say the (Śastra of the) morning pressing should not be in Triṣṭubhs. Otherwise it confuses the (parts of the service) which have fixed metres. (The Śastra) should be that of the one-day rite. The one-day rite is Brahman; [3] this day is Brahman; so Brahman is perfected by Brahman. (2.)

'Thee as a car for help' is the strophe [4] of the Marutvatīya Sastra. 'This juice pressed, Vasu,' is the antistrophe.[5] This is the regular scheme [6] for the one-day rite. The Brāhmaṇa as to it has already [7] been set forth. After reciting first the (hymn [8] of) Vasukra, 'Fair has been the singer's onset,' he inserts a Nivid in the Triṣṭubh (hymn [9]), 'Great, hero-like, controlling men, is Indra.' Now (the reason) that he recites the Vasukra hymn first is that Indra is Vasukra, and (the reason for reciting) 'Great, hero-like, controlling men, is Indra,' is that it contains the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' (3.)

Then he offers the oblations of ghee. Thus he wins success for the calming of the sacrifice and the healing of the sacrificers. There are eight (oblations). By these, indeed, the gods obtained [10] all success; thus also do sacrificers by means of them obtain all success. Then he mutters the mutterings

[1] RV., vii, 95, 4–6.

[2] As only three Tṛcas are from RV., iv, this is curious, but the comm. on Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 8, 10, explains that the three new Tṛcas give the name to the whole to distinguish it from the Vasiṣṭha Praüga, Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxv, 2, of the Viṣuvant.

[3] Cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxv, 3.

[4] RV., viii, 68, 1–3.

[5] RV., viii, 2, 1–3.

[6] This must be the sense here, not 'addition' as taken by Sāyaṇa on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 1; cf. Friedländer, p. 34, n. 4.

[7] Cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xv, 2.

[8] RV., x, 27.

[9] RV., vi, 19.

[10] An untranslatable play on *aṣṭi* and *aṣṭau*, as in Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xvii, 3; xix, 5. For the Mantras of the eight oblations, see Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 12, 1–4, and note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 1.

accompanying the Parimāds. They are Parimāds (those which boil around). The waters indeed are Parimāds, for by the waters all this is boiled around, and so they are the Parimāds. Now the hymn is food. The waters indeed come first before the coming of food, and the waters are the Parimāds. Again, the Parimāds are the nails, teeth, body, and hair. Therefore are they to be employed, for they are bringers of good fortune. There are twenty-five and the conclusion.[1] The Āṅgirasa (Sāman) serves as a support; of that it is a symbol. (Then comes[2] the) Bhūtechad (Sāman); (in reciting it he feels) 'I have reached Indra's dear abode.' Then the Krośa and Anukrośa (they use)—(thereby) have they won; then the Payas (Sāman)—(thereby) have they won; then the Arka and Arkapuṣpa (Sāmans). Arka is Agni here; Arkapuṣpa is Āditya. If the Sāman singers sing a round according to these (Sāmans), then they say to the Hotṛ priest, 'Mutter after us.' If they sing, he should mutter after them;[3] if they sing thus, or even if they do not sing, he should mutter all the same. (4.)

These are the seven divine metres;[4] therefore he should mutter after the (Sāman singers). Again, Indra's indeed is this day, for Indra are the mutterings; therefore he should mutter after them. Then standing there he adores the fire in each of its members, saying 'Honour, Honour.' For the gods are not above receiving honour. He should honour the parts of the fire when it is kindled, if it is on the high altar.[5] Then

[1] For the Parimāds (connected with *mad*, 'be glad,' by Sāyaṇa on Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, x, 1, 2, 8, but see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, ix, 235), see especially Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xliii, 288, n. 2. The seven names are given here, not in the Śatapatha. It is clear that the Śatapatha follows a similar rite to the Śāṅkhāyana, while Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, v, 4, 1–13, and Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, iii, 9, recognise thirteen Parimāds with diverse names.

[2] The following passage is so brief as to be of doubtful interpretation, but I follow Friedländer in regarding the remarks as Arthavāda. It would probably be more natural and perhaps better to take *priyam Indrasya dhāmopajagāma* as a description of the Krośa and Anukrośa, for *jagāma* in early texts is usually third person, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 283.

[3] For the *anujapa*, see Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 12, 5.

[4] i.e. the seven Sāmans. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, vii, 3, 1, 41.

[5] See note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 2, and cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 13, 6.

standing there he adores the sun. Some say[1] he should make an opening in the shed; but he should only perform his adoration in the direction (of the sun). For being concealed in this highest hymn, before the highest,[2] he utters the benedictions[3] 'The great (m.) hath united with the great (f.)'—Agni indeed is great, the earth is great, for these two have united; 'The god hath united with the goddess'—Vāyu is the god, the atmosphere the goddess, for these two have united; 'The Brahman (n.) hath united with the Brāhmaṇī'—the sun is the Brahman, the heaven the Brāhmaṇī, for these two have united. So does he unite these worlds for him who will chant this hymn.[4] (5.)

Viśvāmitra,[5] indeed, went to the dear home of Indra by reason of recitation and the performance of vows. To him said Indra, 'Viśvāmitra, choose a boon.' Viśvāmitra said, 'Let me know thee.' '(Choose) again.' 'Thee only.' '(Choose) a third time.' 'Thee only.' To him said Indra, 'I am the great (m.) and the great (f.); the god and the goddess; the Brahman and the Brāhmaṇī.' Viśvāmitra was still fain to know more. To him said Indra, 'I am that which I have said, but what is more, he that performs no penance may be even such as I am.' Then indeed did Indra proclaim the Vyāhṛtis. They sufficed for him.

Then (the Hotṛ), after gathering to himself the plank of the swing, draws in his breath thrice, after thrice breathing out. (6.)

The (plank of the swing) is of Udumbara wood. Strength and proper food are the Udumbara, so that strength and proper food are won. Then, after touching it with his breast, putting his right side[6] over it, he mutters, 'Thou art the sun. Let

[1] Cf. Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 13, 9, and comm.; the Mantra is given, ibid., 10.
[2] *Parama* of the MSS. is strange, but not impossible; *āditye* must be supplied. Cf. Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, ix, 20; p. 67, n. 3.
[3] They are not wishes proper; he declares the result of his manual acts (Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 15, 10–12), a piece of sympathetic magic.
[4] i.e. Śastra, the Mahad Uktha. The speaker and the object are one.
[5] Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 2, 3, which shows considerable diversity, and which appears more primitive.
[6] This is the sense, not *hṛdayāt pṛthakkurvan* (comm. on Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 16, 1). See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 4; Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, iii, 12, 1. Similar series of deities and metres are common, cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, xiii, 268.

the Vasus mount thee with the Gāyatrī metre. They are thy mounters.' So he says, and 'After them I mount for royal sway.' This, indeed, do they count royal sway. Then, putting his left side over (the swing), he mutters, 'Let the Rudras mount thee with the Triṣṭubh metre. They are thy mounters.' So he says, and 'After them I mount for self-rule.' Self-rule, indeed, is, as it were, something more than royal sway. Then, putting his right side over, he mutters, 'Let the Ādityas mount thee with the Jagatī metre. They are thy mounters.' So he says, and 'After them I mount for universal sway.' Universal sway, indeed, is, as it were, something more than self-rule. Then, putting his left side over, he mutters, 'Let the All-gods mount thee with the Anuṣṭubh metre. They are thy mounters.' So he says, and 'After them I mount for the fulfilling of desire.' The fulfilling of desire is the best of all. Then, having slipped along over (the plank), he brings down his feet towards the east and rests them on the ground. He is thus higher than this world. (The reason) why he places (his feet so) is that he thus rests on this world as a secure resting-place. Then he breathes forth thrice and draws in breath thrice. Then, making a lap over the south and north [1] (sides of the plank), he strokes the plank of the swing from west to east with the span of the right (hand), saying, 'Prajāpati mount thee, Vāyu swing thee.' Prajāpati indeed mounts it, Vāyu swings it, as alive. Then he breathes forth and draws in breath thrice. Then, holding both hands to the east, he mutters. (7.)

'May speech with breath, I with breath, eye with mind, I with mind, Prajāpati with cattle, I with cattle (be united).' So he prays.[2] 'Thou art a fair-winged bird'—breath has fair wings; 'I shall proclaim this speech'—he speaks being

[1] He sits facing east, keeping one leg to the right (=south) and one to the left (=north); for the form, cf. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, ii, 1, 147, 148. The Pet. Lexx. and Monier-Williams render 'hanging over to the right,' which I do not understand. It might be taken (like *dakṣiṇottara*, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, i, 7, 4) as with the legs crossed. Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii, 16, 7, and comm.: *yasmin putrādayas tiṣṭhanti*; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, v, 397; x, 115.

[2] Cf. Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, iv, 2, 10; Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 5.

minded to proclaim this speech; 'which will effect much, I who am minded to effect much'—for this speech is going to effect much, and much (will he effect) who gains the Śastra of this day; 'which will effect more than much, I who am minded to effect more than much'—for this speech is going to effect more than much, and more than much (will he effect) who gains the Śastra of this day; 'which will go to heaven, I that am minded to go to heaven'—for this speech is going to go to heaven, and to heaven (will he go) who gains the Śastra of this day; 'I that am minded to bear these sacrificers to heaven,' so let him say; but (for a sacrificer) whom he hates, let him say, 'Not N. N., not N. N.' So many, indeed, as he enumerates and shakes forth from this divine chariot, he casts forth. The two[1] (following) are not for him to enjoy; so he overcomes him (breath); so, having overcome him, he places him in his body. Vāyu, indeed, becoming breath recites this hymn. So he overcomes him; so, having overcome him, he places him in his body. Yoked indeed to his teacher is he who gains the Śastra of this day. Being yoked to his teacher, his breath is liable to be taken away.[2] So he overcomes him; so, having overcome him, he places him in his body. For such a divinity there is no piercing by poisoned[3] (arrow), nor sword, nor axe, nor anything else. He who reviles him who knows this becomes worse; not so he who knows this. There is no piercing one who knows. (8.)

Adhyāya II.

He begins[4] the hymn with the word '*him*.' The word '*him*' is breath; by breath he begins the hymn. Again, the word

[1] i.e. Vāyu, who is breath (Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, pp. 107-9) and the teacher. The text tells how he overcomes them and makes them *bhogya*. Friedländer renders 'have no right to the Prāṇa which he has to enjoy,' but though this gives an approximate sense it seems difficult to find a parallel construction; for the one assumed, see Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, v, 148. It would be easier if we could read *tan* for *tam*, but it is not essential.

[2] For the construction, cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, x, 2; xvii, 9.

[3] See Zimmer, *Altind. Leben*, p. 299; Murray, *Rise of Greek Epic*, pp. 120 seq.

[4] Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 3, 1.

'*him*' is strength and sap; so he places in the hymn strength and sap. Again, the word '*him*' is immortality; so he places immortality in himself. The Rājana is (the Sāman of) the Pṛṣṭha (Stotra). The Rājana is manifestly the Sāman; so he unites (the hymn [1]) with its own Sāman. It consists of verses not specially marked.[2] Prajāpati, indeed, is not specially marked. That is the symbol of Prajāpati. Some say it should consist of verses with 'Ka' in them, for Ka is Prajāpati and that is a symbol of Prajāpati. Then he recites inaudibly the silent recitation. Speech indeed is this day, mind the silent recitation; so with mind he perfects speech. 'That was mightiest in the worlds' is the strophe [3] Tṛca. 'Waxing [4] with strength, of great might,' has the word 'wax,' and so has the word 'great,' for the day is described as 'great.' The body is of twenty-five parts. He recites (the hymn [5]) with the addition of the *nada* (verses). The body indeed is of twenty-five parts, offspring and cattle are additions, so he increases the body by children, cattle, servants, and food,[6] (in using) the *nada* verses.[7] He puts the Triṣṭubh Pādas first,[8] then the Pādas of the *nada* verses. Having joined the first Pāda of the *nada* verses with the first Triṣṭubh Pāda, he pauses; having joined the second with the second Triṣṭubh (Pāda), he utters the syllable *om*. Having joined the third with the third Triṣṭubh (Pāda), he pauses; having joined the fourth with the fourth Triṣṭubh (Pāda), he utters the syllable *om*. He recites thrice the first (verse) thus varied, and the others which follow are similarly varied. He omits the second half-verse of the third verse of the hymn and the second of the *nada*. This is the opening of the mouth; by that he utters speech. By the mouth indeed

[1] *Enat* seems needed.

[2] i.e. verses not specially assigned to others by some mark are his; Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, ii, 5; Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 16, n. 4.

[3] RV., x, 120, 1.

[4] RV., x, 120, 2.

[5] Read *tan* (i.e. *tad*).

[6] *Iti* probably not='etc.' in such a case. Cf. Knauer, *Festgruss an Böhtlingk*, pp. 62 seq.; Böhtlingk, *Z.D.M.G.*, xli, 516 seq. It may be the *iti* of enumeration, which is very common in this style; see p. 51, n. 6.

[7] RV., viii, 69, 2; see Pischel, *Ved. Stud.*, i, 183–98.

[8] See notes on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 6; i, 3, 8.

he utters speech. He recites these two (half-verses) before the Dvipadās.[1] Thus his Stotra verse is not separated by a break. After reciting the body (verses), he recites the *sūdadohas*[2] (verse) 'of the milk-yielder.' Food indeed is the *sūdadohas* (verse). By food these joints are united. Again, immortality is the *sūdadohas* (verse); so he places immortality in the body. Again, the *sūdadohas* (verse) is the form of the Āhāva call. So just as wood may be joined by a string or a piece of leather, the *sūdadohas* verse joins all the Vedas. (1.)

Then he recites the head (verses). They consist of three Tṛcas. Three indeed are the bones[3] of his head; them by these he unites. These three again are each threefold, and so make up nine verses. Nine indeed are the breaths in the head. They have the word 'hymn' in them. This is the symbol of this day. (2.)

Then he recites the neck (verses). They are three verses. Three indeed are the joints[4] of the neck. These he unites by those. The last is an Uṣṇih. It is the shoulder, large and expansive. (3.)

Then he recites the collarbone[5] (verse). It is a Triṣṭubh. Therefore the collarbone is the strongest. The (verse[6]) 'Indra, the mighty arms of thee, strong one,' is suitable to the arms. Then he recites the strophe and antistrophe of the Rathantara. The Brāhmaṇa for them has been set forth already. Then he recites the Dhāyyā (verse). This is the Dhāyyā, for it is placed in all beings. It indeed is placed on the right side, therefore a woman lies on a man's right side. Then he recites the Pragātha of the Rathantara. The

[1] See ii, 11 fin.

[2] RV., viii, 69, 3.

[3] Here, again, the number is probably fanciful, cf. Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 172 seq., and the stock division of the head into three, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, xii, 2, 4, 9, etc. For the nine breaths—apertures—cf. Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 283, where, however, the older passages are not quoted, and note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 4, 1.

[4] Probably purely unscientific; the official osteology (Hoernle, *Osteology*, p. 64) is quite different. For sections 2–6, cf. notes on the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 2, 1; 2; i, 4, 1; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 2–6.

[5] So *akṣā* certainly, see Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 202 sq.; Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 4, 1; 5, 1; *Z.D.M.G.*, 1908, p. 139.

[6] RV., vi, 47, 8c.

Brāhmaṇa for it has been set forth already. The hymn[1] is 'Who alone of mortals deserves oblation.' He recites it by Pādas. Taking out the second verse of it, he puts in as second (verse) the second (verse) of the hymn,[2] 'All my other friends have come.' Thus he interweaves the two sides to prevent them separating. Therefore he performs all actions by (the use of) both sides. (4.)

Then he recites the hand (verses). They indeed are three. These are the joints[3] of his hand. These he unites by those. The first is in an excessive metre. This is the thumb. So the thumb approaches all the fingers. The right side has the Rathantara, the left the Bṛhat, and the Brāhmaṇa for it has been set forth. These two sides, with Bṛhat and Rathantara, are of twenty-four parts. Twenty-four are the half-months of the year, so that the year is made up. (5.)

Then he recites the Caturuttara (verses). They are the spine. They are twenty-one verses. Twenty-one indeed are the joints[4] of the spine. These he unites by those. They make up seven Tṛcas. Seven indeed are the metres, so that all the metres are made up. They have the word 'hymn.' That is the symbol of this day. (6.)

Then he recites the (sets of) eighty verses. He recites them in correspondence with the Stotra verses, Gāyatrī (corresponding to) Gāyatra, Uṣṇih and Bṛhatī (sets) to Bṛhad and Rathantara. The Gāyatrī (set) is the right side, the Uṣṇih the left, the Bṛhatī the middle. In the middle indeed of the body is food deposited. Between the two Triṣṭubhs there is a Triṣṭubh in a Nivid.[5] They belong to Viśvāmitra, are corresponding, and have the word 'hymn.' For Viśvāmitra was the seer of that (hymn). The strophes contain the word 'great,' and they have the word 'magnify.'[6] It (the hymn) has the word 'magnified'

[1] RV., vi, 22. See Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxv, 5; 6.
[2] RV., x, 28.
[3] Hoernle, *Osteology*, p. 36.
[4] Possibly this means, as in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, xii, 2, 4, 12 (Hoernle, *Osteology*, p. 106), the twenty transverse processes of the abdominal portion of the spine (*udara*), but the word is *anūka* and the number there is thirty-two, the spine itself in either case making the odd figure.
[5] RV., iii, 31, 9 and 11; Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 9, 4–7.
[6] Read *vṛdhavatyaḥ*, etc., not *vṛddha°*. For Viśvāmitra, cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxviii, 2.

and the word 'great.' It has the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' (7.)

'Great Indra, who by might,' and 'is magnified by Vatsa's lauds': with this verse[1] he commences the Gāyatrī (set of) eighty (verses). It (the verse) contains both the words 'great' and 'magnify.' It (the litany) has the words 'great' and 'magnified.' It has the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' (8.)

'What joys thou didst bring, Indra,' and 'his praises magnify, great one': with this verse[2] he begins the Bṛhatī (set of) eighty (verses). It (the verse) contains both the words 'great' and 'magnify.' It (the hymn) has the words 'great' and 'magnify.' It has the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' 'May this delightful (Soma) for thee' and 'Hither, with thy bay steeds, Indra,' are the two hymns.[3] (The reason) why he recites them at the end is that he may commence the Uṣṇih (set of) eighty verses (after concluding) with perfect Bṛhatīs. (9.)

'Indra in the poured libations,' and 'He gains the power that magnifies; for he is great': with this verse[4] he begins the Uṣṇih (set of) eighty verses. It (the verse) contains both the words 'great' and 'magnify.' It (the hymn) has the words 'great' and 'magnify.' It has the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' These sets of eighty (verses) recited together make up 720.[5] 720 indeed are the days and nights of the year. Thus by these (sets of) eighty he obtains the days and nights of the year. Some make into Uṣṇihs the Gāyatrīs by means of the ends of the Sāmans; others, again, add (to make the Uṣṇihs) (sets of) four syllables. From the Bṛhatī (set of) eighty (verses) he takes out eighty (sets of) four syllables; from the Kakubh Pragāthas twenty-four (sets of) four syllables; these 104 sets of four syllables he inserts in the

[1] RV., viii, 6, 1. For sections 6–17, cf. notes on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 4, 3; v, 2, 3–5; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 7–21.
[2] RV., viii, 97, 1.
[3] RV., iii, 44; 45.
[4] RV., viii, 13, 1.
[5] For this, see *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, p. 36, and notes on v, 2, 3–5: Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xli, 111 seq.

104 Gāyatrīs. So the Gāyatrīs are turned into Uṣṇihs. But one need not be concerned with this.[1] The (result) is here brought about. 'Sing to Indra the Sāman': (the reason) why he recites this[2] last is that he may commence the *vaśa* (hymn), (after concluding) with perfect Uṣṇihs. (10.)

Then he recites the *vaśa* (hymn[3]). The belly is the *vaśa* hymn. With it, when made ready, whatever is outside it would come into immediate proximity. Thus it matures what is within the belly. Therefore many deities and many metres are recited in the *vaśa* (hymn). Therefore much variegated food is deposited in the belly. Then (he recites) the two half-verses[4] which were taken out. Then (he recites) the *sūdadohas* (verse). It is then left out (afterwards). Here it has been recited twenty-four times. (11.)

Then he recites the Dvipadās. Metre indeed is a support, so that the Dvipadās serve as a support. (12.)

Then he recites the hymn to Indra and Agni, reciting it as in Gāyatrī. Indra and Agni are supports, so that support is obtained. (13.)

Then he recites the Āvapana.[5] The Āvapana is a support, so that support is obtained. Then these go on again straight forward. (14.)

Then he recites the Anuṣṭubh text. Speech indeed is this day; speech the Anuṣṭubh. So in speech he places speech. 'Ye have gone to the sky, ye have gone to the sky': with this hymn[6] he approaches the gods. The Tṛca 'He, of old, inspiring sages,'[7] has the word 'hymn,' and by reason of it is

[1] i.e. the precise method of the transformation.

[2] RV., viii, 98, 1; cf. ii, 9. The hymns are Uṣṇih and Bṛhatī respectively. *Saṃsiddha* is a metaphor from cooking, like *saṃskṛta*.

[3] RV., viii, 46. See Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, i, 7 sq.; Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 5, 1; Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xli, 112, n. 2.

[4] ii, 1; cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, viii, 6, 2, 4, and for the Aindrāgna Sūkta (RV., viii, 40), Eggeling, l.c., p. 113, n. 1.

[5] i.e. insertion, which explains the last words. Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 5, 2; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, viii, 6, 2, 3; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 17.

[6] The Bodleian MS. reads *jaya* for *yaya*. The reference is clearly to RV., viii, 34, 1^d–15^d.

[7] The Bodleian MS. reads, correctly, *pratnathā* and *kavivṛdha*; see RV., viii, 63, 4.

perfect. The last verse is in Gāyatrī, and by reason of it it is perfect. In[1] 'Thou art the great ruler here' there is the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' (15.)

Then he recites the hundred Triṣṭubhs. The Triṣṭubh is Indra's metre; so he perfects him with his own metre. The Hiraṇyastūpa[2] hymn and the Yātaūtīya[3] hymn correspond to the Bṛhat and Rathantara. For the Bṛhat and Rathantara are put in front. The Sajanīya[4] hymn and (the hymn[5]) 'Priests, bear to Indra the Soma' make up twenty-seven verses. Twenty-seven are the Nakṣatras; thus he obtains the majesty of the Nakṣatras. He should recite (a hymn) of Viśvāmitra, for Viśvāmitra beheld it. He should recite (a hymn) of Vāmadeva, for that is pleasant[6] to the gods. He should recite (a hymn) of Vasiṣṭha, for that is best for the gods. Then before the Udubrahmīya[7] (hymn) he recites (the verses) with interwoven Pādas. All desires, indeed, are within this hymn. Just as having shut cattle in a pen one puts a bar and a pin[8] (to keep them in), so by these intertwined verses he grasps all desires on either side and places them in the body. Again, of the Udubrahmīya hymn the last (verse) has the word 'hymn.' That is the symbol of this day. He concludes by repeating this (verse) thrice. Having concluded he mutters the Ukthavīrya. The one-day form comes first; the one-day is a support, so that support is obtained. The Mahāvrata form comes next. In[9] 'Thou art great' there is the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' (16.)

Reckoning in the *sūdadohas* verse, recited once, which has to be supplied throughout the litany, but without the silent recitation, there are a thousand Bṛhatīs. In this thousand

[1] RV., x, 152, 1. Also quoted in xii, 7 fin.; see Sūtra, xviii, 18.
[2] RV., i, 32; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iii, 24.
[3] RV., vi, 25; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 19, 3.
[4] RV., ii, 12.
[5] RV., ii, 14, 1. The next hymns referred to are iii, 43; iv, 16; vii, 24.
[6] Vāmadeva's own allusion to his name; cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 2, 1.
[7] RV., vii, 23; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 19, 10; 20, 6. For the interweaving, cf. note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 5, 2; v, 3, 1; Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xli, 113, n. 1; Roth, *Z.D.M.G.*, xxxvii, 106.
[8] *Argaleṣike* must have this sense or something like it. Add. to dict.
[9] i.e. in the Mahāvrata form, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 20, 8. Cf. note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 3, 1.

Bṛhatīs there are thirty-six thousand syllables. So many are the days of a hundred years; thus he obtains the days of a hundred years.[1] Some say (the thousand) is composed of Anuṣṭubhs. Speech indeed is that day, speech the Anuṣṭubh, speech all beings; again, speech is this all, so they say. But it is fixed that it is composed of Bṛhatīs. For he that gives heat here is connected with the Bṛhatī; so he perfects him with his own metre. Three times he calls (to the Adhvaryu). Three indeed are these worlds; so he obtains these worlds. The Yājyā verse is taken from the one-day (rite). The one-day (rite) is a support, so that support is obtained. They loosen the swing, before the secondary *vaṣaṭ*[2] cry is made. He descends towards the east (to meet) him who bears the Graha as he advances. He thrusts away to the west the plank of the swing. Touching the Graha, he mutters, 'This victory I have won, let me be associated with it, lest I sever myself from this victory.' The Atigrāhya is for Viśvakarman. Prajāpati's indeed is this day, Prajāpati is Viśvakarman; thus he perfects him with his own symbol.

This day Indra proclaimed to Aṅgiras, Aṅgiras to Dīrghatamas. Therefore did Dīrghatamas live ten lives of man. This, too, the Ṛṣi has recorded, Dīrghatamas, son of Mamatā, in the words[3] 'In the tenth stage of eld.' If a man desire life, this is the Śastra to use, so said Kauṣītaki.[4] So he who knows thus and recites (the litany of) this day, lives all his life in this world and obtains immortality and imperishableness in the world of heaven. (17.)

'We choose that of Savitṛ' is the strophe of the Vaiśvadeva[5]

[1] Read with the Berlin and Bodleian MSS.: *tāvanti śatasaṃvatsarasyāhāni bhavanti tac chatasaṃvatsarasyāhāny āpnoti.*

[2] For this and the following, cf. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Opfer und Zauber*, p. 102; note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 2, 4; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 21; I read, of course, *prājaiṣam.*

[3] RV., i, 158, 6, which presumably really means 'in the tenth decade.'

[4] Repeatedly referred to in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, and again in iv, 1; 7; xv (Kahola). The word is a mere patronymic, and we must probably distinguish two members at least of the family, Viśvajit and Kahoḷa, the latter being perhaps the Kauṣītaki *par excellence.*

[5] This section contains the hymns for the two Śastras of the evening Soma-pressing. See RV., v, 82, 1–3; note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 5, 3; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 22 and 23.

(Śastra). (The strophe) contains the word 'great' because of the occurrence[1] of 'we choose.' (The Śastra) has the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' 'To-day, god Savitṛ' is the antistrophe.[2] It contains the word 'great' because of the occurrence of the words 'May we win all good things.' (The Śastra) has the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' 'That desirable greatness of the god Savitṛ' is a Savitṛ hymn.[3] It has the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' 'They, heaven and earth, all propitious,' is a hymn[4] to heaven and earth. (The verse[5]) 'Widely-capacious, great, never-failing,' contains the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' 'Why has the best, why has the youngest, come to us,' is a hymn[6] to the Ṛbhus. (The verse) 'We blame not the bowl of great birth' contains the word 'great,' for this day is described as 'great.' 'Of the aged, grey-haired Hotṛ,' is the 'Water' hymn,[7] addressed to the All-gods. For that is the water of the gods. He places a Nivid in the (hymn) of the one-day rite. The one-day (rite) is support, so that support is won. The (hymn of the) one-day rite is addressed to Vaiśvānara.[8] The one-day (rite) is support, so that support is won. 'The Maruts rushing onwards with gleaming lances,' is a hymn[9] to the Maruts. (The hymn) contains the words 'mighty' and 'great' in 'Ye great ones, mightily and wide ye rule,' for this day is described as great. 'Of a truth the fair refulgence was established' is a hymn[10] to Jātavedas. The last (verse), 'With hymns of might hath Agni now been praised,' contains the word 'hymn.' That is the symbol of this day. These are the hymns of the Āgnimāruta (Śastra).

These are the hymns of this day. So ends the Agniṣṭoma.[11] Brahman(n.) is the Agniṣṭoma. Brahman is this day. So they place Brahman in Brahman. They obtain immortality who observe (the ritual of) this day. (18.)

[1] The sense seems to be that *vṛṇīmahe* gives *mah*, as *dhīmahi* below.
[2] RV., v, 82, 4-6.
[3] RV., iv, 53, 1.
[4] RV., i, 160.
[5] RV., i, 160, 2.
[6] RV., i, 161.
[7] RV., i, 164, 1.
[8] RV., iii, 3.
[9] RV., v, 55, 1.
[10] RV., i, 141, 1.
[11] Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 3, 2 fin. The Agniṣṭoma is the Prakṛti of the Mahāvrata.

Adhyāya III.

Citra Gāṅgyāyani,[1] being about to sacrifice, chose Āruṇi (as the priest). He sent his son, Śvetaketu, saying, 'Perform the sacrifice.' Him when he had arrived (the King) addressed, 'Thou art the son of Gautama. Is there a secret place[2] in the world where thou wilt set me, or is there any road and wilt thou set me in the world to which that road leads?' He said, 'I do not know that. I will ask my teacher.' Going to his father he asked him, saying, 'Thus did he question me. How shall I reply?' He replied, 'I also do not know that; we will learn in his house and gain the knowledge, for even others give to us. Come, we will both go.' With fuel in his hand he went to Citra Gāṅgyāyani, saying, 'Let me approach thee.' He said to him, 'Thou art fit to receive the knowledge of Brahman,[3] since thou hast not been proud. Come, I will instruct thee.' (1.)

He said: Those who depart from this world all go to the moon. Their breaths swell the first fortnight (of the moon); in the second it brings them to birth again.[4] The moon is also the door of the world of heaven. Him who can answer,[5] it sends

[1] More likely than the obvious v.l. Gārgyāyani of Śaṅkarānanda's recension.

[2] The question is vague and mysterious. *Yasya* and *anyataro*, suggested by Max Müller, would be easier, but mystery is in place, and too much need not be made of it. Deussen paraphrases it satisfactorily as 'Is there any end of transmigration, and will you set me on the path to it?' Śaṅkarānanda's recension has the very unsatisfactory *anyam utāho* for *anyatamo*, and renders *vādhvā* as *baddhvā*, contrasting a secret with a non-secret place. Max Müller renders 'Is there a hidden place . . . or is it the other way.' Böhtlingk, *Ber. d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.*, xlii, 198, adopts practically the same view as Deussen does.

[3] Deussen reads *agraṇīr* for *grāhī*; Śaṅkarānanda has *brahmārghaḥ*, but the text, if less easy, is certain.

[4] 'Gladdens them not,' in Śaṅkarānanda's version. Max Müller's conjecture *aparapakṣe* is not necessary.

[5] I follow Deussen. The moon is the centre of the Devayāna and Pitṛyāna, and sends on the one who can reply. Śaṅkarānanda, Cowell, Max Müller, take *pratyāha* as 'reject.' For the theory, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, vi, 1 (= 2 K.); Chāndogya Upaniṣad, v, 3–10; and Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, pp. 137–40, with whose view of the priority of these two Upaniṣads to the Kauṣītaki I agree. Max Müller recognises two classes: the former, which rejects the moon and is set free at once; the latter, which rejects Svarga, and is then set free, but the sense 'set free' is hardly to be got out of *atisṛjate*. It means 'sends on.'

on; him who answers it not, it rains down on earth, becoming itself rain. He is born on earth as a worm, or a grasshopper, or a fish, or a bird, or a lion, or a boar, or a snake (?),[1] or a tiger, or a man, or another creature, in one or other station according to his deeds and his knowledge. Him, when he has arrived, it asks, 'Who art thou?' To it should he reply,[2] 'From the light I came as seed, O seasons, from that produced as the fifteen-fold fatherland. In the man as creator ye placed me, and by man as creator impregnated the mother. I am born and again born as the twelve-month (year) and the thirteen-month (year), from the twelve-fold, the thirteen-fold father. I know this and I recognise this. Then do ye bear

[1] *Paraśvān*. Śaṅkarānanda has *daṇḍaśūkaviśeṣaḥ vāśabdād vṛścikādiḥ*, Böhtlingk's *Dict.* compares *parasvant*, 'wild ass' (Atharva Veda, Paipp.); 'Beisstier,' Deussen; 'dog,' Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 396.

[2] What follows is in verse, and as it has been much misunderstood (even in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*) I give the text as I restore it—

' *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo reta ābhṛtam pañcadaśāt prasūtāt pitryāvatas* |
tan mā puṃsi kartary erayadhvam puṃsā kartrā mātari māsiṣiñca || 1 ||
sa jāyamāna upajāyamāno dvādaśatrayodaśopamāsaḥ |
dvādaśatrayodaśena pitrā saṃ tad vide 'haṃ prati tad vide 'ham
tan martavo 'mṛtyava ābharadhvam || 2 || '

I keep *erayadhvam*; Deussen suggests *airayadhvam*, but the augment is not needed. For the *mā niṣiṃ ca* of the ordinary recension (including the Berlin and Bodleian MSS.), or the *māsiṣikta* of Śaṅkarānanda's recension, adopted by Deussen, I read *mā-āsiṣiñca* as 2nd plur. perf. with strong form (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 284) *metri causa*. Bloomfield, p. 588[a], conjectures *niṣiñcata*, but this would hardly have been corrupted, and the conjecture ignores the fact that, though the first two Pādas are in Jagatī, the third and presumably the fourth are in Triṣṭubh. The verse occurs in Jaminīya Brāhmaṇa, i, 18; 50, where *taṃ mā puṃsi* is, of course, palæographically the same as *tan*, which (=*retas*) I prefer, and the last Pāda reads *puṃsaḥ kartur mātary āsiṣikta*, also a Triṣṭubh. In v. 2 *jāyamāna* is Deussen's certain restoration for *jāya* (Berlin reads *jāyamānaḥ*, only showing how easy the omission was). For *dvādaśatrayodaśopamāsaḥ*, Cowell's MS. A, Berlin and Bodleian MSS. have *dvādaśatrayodaśo māsaḥ*, Śaṅkarānanda's recension °*trayodaśa upamāsaḥ*, which gives perhaps the pronunciation of the real text, though it is much more probably *dūā*°, as in Pāda 3. I read *sam*, not *āsam*, and *metri causa* begin a new Pāda with it; *vide* I recognise as a verbal form, not an infinitive. In his version Cowell accepts one view of Śaṅkarānanda that *ṛtavaḥ* is in the first verse abl., in the second acc., and that *vide* is infin., *āsam*, 'I was.' Deussen takes the other view of Śaṅkarānanda in the first case, in both cases rightly, of *ṛtavaḥ* as voc., but adheres to *āsam*, *vide* as infin., and reads *mṛtyave* for *amṛtyave*, which is unnecessary, since we need not take the verb as imperfect. His *martavo* for the archaic *ma ṛtavo* I have accepted *metri causa*. The Berlin MS. in a correction reads *ārabhadhvam*, like Ānand. MS. Gh. Max Müller agrees with Cowell, and both render the first two second persons as if third persons. Ānand. has *niṣikta*. Cf. *J.A.O.S.*, xix, 118.

me, seasons, to deathlessness. By that truth, that penance, I am the season of the seasons.' 'Who[1] art thou?' 'I am thou.' He then sends him on. (2.)

He having reached the road of the gods arrives at the world of Agni, then at the world of Vāyu, the world of Varuṇa, the world of Indra, the world of Prajāpati, the world of Brahman.[2] Of that world[3] is the lake Āra (of enemies), the moments Yeṣṭiha (which destroy the sacrifice[4]), the Vijarā (unaging) river, the Ilya[5] tree, the Sālajya[6] city, the Aparājita (unconquerable) palace, Indra and Prajāpati the doorkeepers, the hall Vibhu, the throne Vicakṣaṇā, the couch Amitaujas (of unsurpassed splendour), the dear Mānasī (spirit of mind), her peer Cākṣuṣī (spirit of the eye), who weave[7] the worlds holding flowers in their hands, the Apsarases, Ambā[8] and Ambāyavī, and the streams Ambayāḥ. The knower advances to that world. Brahman says of him, 'Run to meet him with the glory due to me. He has won the unaging river. He shall never grow old.' (3.)

[1] 'Who am I? Who art thou?' in Śaṅkarānanda's recension. The father and son are both here identified with the year of twelve or thirteen months (*upamāsa* is curious and refers to the intercalary month). The question 'Who art thou?' is probably the moon's (so all the translators). It might be rhetorical, and the omission of *iti* is doubtful; see *Synt. Forsch.*, v, 533; Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xliv, 61, 355.

[2] We need not doubt the personal Brahman anywhere in this Upaniṣad. On the other hand, neither the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa nor Āraṇyaka, i–iii, know him; cf. von Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 91.

[3] Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, viii, 5, 3, where occur the Somasavana tree, the Aparājitā city, the Prabhuvimita, and the Airaṃmadīya lake, the Ara and Ṇya seas, etc., and Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 398, 399.

[4] This is Weber's rendering, taking *yeṣṭi* from *yaj*. It is admittedly conjectural, but *yeṣṭi* is read in Cowell's MSS. and the Berlin MS., and is probably correct.

[5] Śaṅkarānanda derives it from *ilā*, so evidently read *ilya*, not *ilpa*. Deussen accepts this. Cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, iii, 312, n. 3.

[6] 'Protected by bow-strings thick as Sāl trees,' Deussen with Śaṅkarānanda.

[7] *āvayato* (not °*tau* as Śaṅkarānanda) and probably *caiva* for *vai ca* should be read. For *jagāni*, a *vox nihili*, read *jaganti*, an easy corruption, as the *i* is easily confused with an *ā-i*. Below Deussen joins 'with my glory' with the following words, but this is against their place in the sentence.

[8] Weber, p. 183, has *ambāyavāḥ*, like Ānand. MS. Gh. The form is irregular, and may be an error for *ambāyavīḥ*. The exact sense of these expressions must remain in doubt, but probably they are all variants of 'mother,' Böhtlingk's *Dict.*, s.vv.

Five hundred Apsarases advance towards him, a hundred with fruit[1] in their hands, a hundred with unguents, a hundred with garlands, a hundred with garments, a hundred with aromatic powders. Him they adorn with the ornaments of Brahman. He, adorned with the ornaments of Brahman, knowing Brahman, advances to Brahman(n.). He arrives at the lake of enemies. He crosses it by his mind. Men who know but the present, on coming to it, are overwhelmed. He arrives at the moments which destroy the sacrifice. They flee from him. He arrives at the unaging river. He crosses it by his mind alone. His good deeds and his evil deeds then shake themselves off.[2] His dear relatives obtain his good deeds, his enemies his bad. Just as a man driving on a chariot may look down at the wheels of the chariot, so may he look down at day and night, good deeds and evil deeds, and all opposites. He, severed from good, severed from evil deeds, knowing Brahman, advances to Brahman(n.). (4.)

He arrives at the Ilya tree. The odour of Brahman reaches him. He arrives at the Sālajya city. The savour of Brahman reaches him. He arrives at the unconquerable palace. The splendour of Brahman reaches him. He arrives at Indra and Prajāpati, the doorkeepers. They flee from him. He arrives at the hall Vibhu. The glory of Brahman reaches him. He arrives at the throne Vicakṣaṇā. The Sāmans, Bṛhad and Rathantara, are its eastern[3] feet; Śyaita and Naudhasa its western feet; Vairūpa and Vairāja the sides south and north; Śākvara and Raivata the sides east and west. It is knowledge, for by knowledge he discerns. He arrives at the couch of unsurpassed splendour. It is breath. The past and the future are its eastern feet; prosperity and food its western feet; (the Sāmans) Bhadra and Yajñāyajñīya are the

[1] Śaṅkarānanda's recension has *phaṇa*, 'ornaments,' a mere misreading.

[2] Read *dhunvāte*, which alone accounts for the variants *dhunutevā*, *dhunvate*, *dhunuvāte*, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 388.

[3] These expressions are taken with Śaṅkarānanda, Cowell, and Max Müller, as local, not merely front, etc., though the two would coincide. I read *tiraścye*, see Whitney on Atharva Veda, xv, 3, 5. Cf. also Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii, 12; Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, ii, 24. In Lātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, iii, 12, 2, *anūcī* and *tiraścī* are read. Cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 401; Aufrecht, ibid., pp. 122 seq.

(bars) at the head[1] (and foot); Bṛhad and Rathantara are the (bars) across; the Ṛc verses and the Sāmans the cords[2] running east (and west); the Yajus verses the cords across; the rays of the moon are the cushion; the Udgītha the support[3]; prosperity the pillow. Thereon sits Brahman. The knower first mounts on it with one foot. Brahman asks him, 'Who art thou?' To him let him reply. (5.)

'I am the season, of the season, born of the ether as womb, as seed from wife,[4] the glory of the year, the soul of all that has been. Thou art the soul of all that has been. What thou art, that am I.' He says to him, 'Who am I?' 'Truth,' let him say. 'What is truth?' 'That which is other than the gods and the breaths, that is being (*sat*); the gods and the breaths are that (*tyam*). This is called by the (one[5]) word "truth" (*sattyam*). Such is all this; all this art thou.' So he says to him. This is laid down in a verse. (6.)

'The indestructible, which has the Yajus as belly, the Sāman as head, the Ṛc as form, he should be known as Brahman, the Ṛṣi, composed of Brahman, the great one.'[6]

He says to him, 'How dost thou obtain my male names?' 'By breath,' he should reply. 'How female names?'. 'By

[1] *Śīrṣaṇye* is the usual brachylogy of 'head (and feet),' I think. So Max Müller, with Cowell. Max Müller takes *irā* as 'earth.'

[2] So probably *tantu*, being used in Atharva, xv, 3, 6. 'Cornices,' Cowell with Śaṅkarānanda; 'Längsborten' and 'Querborten,' Deussen; 'Aufzug' and 'Einschlag,' Weber; 'sheets,' Max Müller.

[3] I read *uparaśrayaḥ* (*udgithōp°*, an irregular Sandhi). The *upaśrīḥ* of the scholiast, though accepted by Max Müller and Whitney (on Atharva, xv, 3, 8), is merely a dittograph of *śrīr* following. Cowell's *udgītho 'paraś ca yaḥ* with his MSS. and my Berlin and Bodleian MSS. is a corruption of an unknown word. Possibly *upaśrayaḥ*, as in Atharva, l.c., may be correct. The rendering given is Whitney's; 'coverlet,' Cowell, Deussen, Max Müller, Weber, and Lexx. Cf. v, 1.

[4] *Bhāryāyai* is supported by my MSS., and must be right; *bhāyai* of Śaṅkarānanda is impossible. The version above agrees with that of Cowell and Deussen in substance. Max Müller has 'sprung from the womb of endless space, from the light (from the luminous Brahman). The light, the origin of the year, which is the past, which is the present, which is all living things, and all elements is the Self,' but despairs of the original reading, unnecessarily it seems, for *bhāyai* is an easy error for *bhāryāyai*, and the other variant *etat* not difficult for *retas*.

[5] The Berlin MS. actually has *ekayā*.

[6] Not in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*. *Yajūdaraḥ* is noteworthy and early in character.

speech.' 'How neuter (names)?' 'By mind.' 'How scents?' 'By smell.'[1] 'How forms?' 'By the eye.' 'How sounds?' 'By the ear.' 'How the savour of food?' 'By the tongue.' 'How actions?' 'By the hands.' 'How pleasure and pain?' 'By the body.' 'How joy, dalliance, offspring?' 'By the organ of generation.' 'How moving?' 'By the feet.' 'How thoughts, what is to be known, desires?' 'By intelligence alone,' he should reply. To him he says, 'The waters indeed are my world, this is thine.' What victory, what success, Brahman has, he wins that victory, he attains that success, who knows this. (7.)

Adhyāya IV.

'Breath is Brahman,' says Kauṣītaki. Of this breath which is Brahman the mind is the messenger, the eye the protector, the ear the proclaimer, speech the tirewoman. He who knows mind as the messenger of this breath which is Brahman becomes possessed of the messenger, eye as the protector becomes possessed of the protector, ear as the proclaimer becomes possessed of the proclaimer, speech as the tirewoman becomes possessed of the tirewoman. To this breath which is Brahman all these deities, unasked, pay homage; so to him who knows this all beings, unasked, pay homage. His secret rule[2] is, 'One must not beg.' Just as one having begged through a village without getting anything sits down, (saying), 'I would not eat anything given from this (place),' then those who formerly refused him invite him, thus is the rule of him who begs not. The givers of food invite him, (saying), 'We give.' (1.)

'Breath is Brahman,' so says Paiṅgya. Of this breath which

[1] *Prāṇa* and *ghrāṇa* are so alike in Devanāgarī that one need have little hesitation in accepting here *ghrāṇa* with Cowell's MS. A, the Berlin and Bodleian MSS., though *prāṇa* could mean 'smell,' and frequently is used decisively in that sense, especially when a verbal form of *prāṇ* is used. Śaṅkarānanda adds (so Weber, but not Anquetil) after the eye, touch and the skin.

[2] Such a use is decidedly against Oldenberg's theory of the meaning of *upaniṣad* as 'worship.' Cf. Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 13, and see Oldenberg's articles, *Z.D.M.G.*, l, 457, and liv, 70. *Pariveṣṭrī* is rendered 'housekeeper' by Max Müller; 'waitress' by Deussen.

is Brahman after speech the eye envelops; after the eye the ear envelops; after the ear the mind envelops; after the mind breath envelops.[1] To this breath which is Brahman all these deities, unasked, pay homage; so to him who knows this all beings, unasked, pay homage. His secret rule is, 'One must not beg.' Just as one having begged through a village without getting anything sits down, (saying), 'I would not eat anything given from this (place),' then those who formerly refused him invite him, thus is the rule of him who begs not. The givers of food invite him, (saying), 'We give.' (2.)

Then follows the obtaining of a choice portion of wealth. If a man desire a choice portion of wealth, on the night of full or new moon or in the bright fortnight under[2] an auspicious Nakṣatra, on one of these seasons, he places the fire, sweeps round, scatters (grass) about, sprinkles (water), purifies (the ghee),[3] and bending his right knee offers oblations of ghee with a ladle. 'The deity, speech by name, is the obtainer. May she obtain this for me from N. N. To her *svāhā*. The deity, smell[4] by name, is the obtainer. May he obtain this for me from N. N. To him *svāhā*. The deity, the eye by name, is the obtainer. May it obtain this for me from N. N. To it *svāhā*. The deity, the ear by name, is the obtainer. May it obtain this for me from N. N. To it *svāhā*. The deity, mind by name, is the obtainer. May it obtain this for me from N. N. To it *svāhā*. The deity, intelligence by name, is the obtainer. May she obtain this for me from N. N. To her *svāhā*.' Then, having inhaled the fragrance of the smoke, and having

[1] This appears the best rendering of the somewhat doubtful text, *ārundhate* being a 3rd sing. from a by-form of *rudh*. The reading of Śaṅkarānanda and Max Müller, *ārundhe*, may be dismissed as a facile conjecture, and Cowell's conjecture, *ārudhyate*, is not necessary. For the sense, cf. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, ii. Max Müller renders 'stands firm behind,' and reads *śrotraparastāt*, which, though not essential, is very probable.

[2] The absence of *vā* after *nakṣatre* suggests three seasons (*parvan*), each to have an auspicious Nakṣatra. Śaṅkarānanda thinks there are four, the dark half being a *vikalpa*! Cowell gives four, Deussen three.

[3] Omitted by accident in Cowell's text. Śaṅkarānanda's recension has 'with a ladle, *camasa*, or *kaṃsa*.' Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, vi, 3; *infra*, xii, 8, for the ritual.

[4] Possibly *ghrāṇo* should be read, the unusual gender helping the alteration to *prāṇo*. Similarly, in iv, 4.

anointed his limbs with ghee, he should go forth, restraining his speech, and declare his desire (to the man in question), or send a messenger. He then obtains it.[1] (3.)

Then follows the divine desire. If a man desire to be dear to any man or woman, or men or women, on one of these seasons, he places a fire and offers in the same manner oblations of ghee. 'Thy speech I offer in myself here, *svāhā*. Thy smell I offer in myself here, *svāhā*. Thine eye I offer in myself here, *svāhā*. Thine ear I offer in myself here, *svāhā*. Thy mind I offer in myself here, *svāhā*. Thine intelligence I offer in myself here, *svāhā*.' Then, having inhaled the fragrance of the smoke, and having anointed his limbs with ghee, he should go forth, restraining his speech, and should seek to place himself in contact (with the object of his desire), or should stand in his wind addressing him. He indeed becomes beloved; of him they have desire. (4.)

Then follows the restraint of Pratardana.[2] They call it the inner Agnihotra. So long as a man speaks, so long he cannot breathe. Then he offers breath in speech. So long as a man breathes, so long he cannot speak. Then he offers speech in breath. These eternal, immortal, oblations he ever offers, awake or asleep. Again, other oblations are not eternal, for they are compact of action. Therefore ancient sages did not offer the (ordinary) Agnihotra. (5.)

'The hymn is Brahman,' so says Śuṣkabhṛṅgāra. Let him worship it as Ṛc. All beings, indeed, are won by worship[3] for his excellence. Let him worship it as Yajus. All beings indeed, are yoked to him for his excellence. Let him worship it as Sāman. All beings, indeed, bow to him for his excellence. Let him worship it as prosperity. Let him worship it as glory. Let him worship it as splendour. Just

[1] This and the next chapter are curious examples of sympathetic magic, of which the Vedic ritual is so full. Cf. Caland, *Altindisches Zauberritual*; Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii; and with iv, 4, Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa, ii, 5; 6.

[2] Cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxvi, 5, for him as a teacher. The similarity of 1 Cor. x, 31, cited by Deussen is not obvious.

[3] Śaṅkarānanda renders as active, and so Cowell; 'Zujauchzen gemacht,' Deussen; 'will praise him,' Max Müller, who renders also below 'will join before him.' The Berlin MS. has *abhyarcante*.

as it is among the Śastras[1] the most prosperous, glorious, and splendid, so among all creatures he who knows this becomes the most prosperous, glorious, and splendid. The Adhvaryu prepares the self to be connected with sacrifice[2] and compact of work. In it he weaves what is compact of the Yajus. In what is compact of the Yajus, the Hotṛ weaves what is compact of the Ṛc; in what is compact of the Ṛc, the Udgātṛ weaves what is compact of the Sāman. He is the soul of the threefold knowledge; he is the soul of Indra,[3] who knows this. (6.)

Then follow the three meditations of Sarvajit[4] Kauṣītaki. Sarvajit Kauṣītaki adores the rising sun, having put on the sacrificial thread, and having brought water, and having thrice sprinkled the cup of water, (saying), 'Thou art the scatterer; scatter away my sins.' In the same manner (he adores him) at the zenith, (saying), 'Thou art the utter scatterer; utterly scatter away my sins.' In the same manner (he adores him) at his setting, (saying), 'Thou art the complete scatterer; completely scatter away my sins.' Thus, whatever evil by day or night he does, this he scatters completely.[5] Therefore, he who knows this in this manner adores the sun. Whatever evil he does by day or night, this he scatters completely. (7.)

[1] 'Weapon,' Śaṅkarānanda, followed by Cowell and Max Müller, forgetting that the Āraṇyaka treats of this very Śastra. Cf. Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xli, p. xiv.

[2] Śaṅkarānanda reads and translates *aiṣṭakam*; hence Cowell's version, 'connected with the sacrificial bricks.' For the sense, cf. i, 1; Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 1–3; Deussen, *Allgem. Gesch. der Phil.*, i, 328.

[3] Max Müller takes this differently. He translates above, 'conceives the fire of the altar, which is used for the sacrifice, to be himself. In it he (the Adhvaryu) weaves,' and adopts the text of Śaṅkarānanda's recension, slightly modified, *sa eṣa sarvasyai trayyai vidyāyā ātmā, eṣa u evāsyātmā. Etadātmā bhavati ya evaṃ veda*, 'He (the Adhvaryu or *prāṇa*) is the self of the threefold knowledge; he indeed is the self of it (of *prāṇa*). He who knows this is the self of it (becomes *prāṇa*).' Śaṅkarānanda himself takes *asya* as *uktāyās trayyai*.

[4] I think this must be a proper name, though Śaṅkarānanda does not so take it, and is followed by Cowell, Max Müller, and Deussen. But see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 404. The use of the sacrificial cord is noteworthy; Max Müller compares Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii, 10, 9, 12. For *varga*, cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, iii, 271.

[5] Omitted in Ānand. ed. *Akarot* is curious; see p. xiv.

Then on every month, on [1] the night of new moon, let him adore the moon when it is seen in the west in the same manner, or let him throw towards it two blades of young grass,[2] (saying), 'That fair heart of mine resting in the moon in the sky, I deem myself to know. May I never weep for misfortune to my children.' His children [3] die not before him. This (is the rite) for one who has a son. Then follows that for one who has no son. Having recited the three verses,[4] 'Do thou wax great, be thou united,' 'May thy draughts, may my strengths be united,' 'The drop which the Ādityas make to swell,' he revolves round his right arm, (saying), 'Increase not by our lives, children, and cattle; he who hates us and whom we hate, increase by his life, children, and cattle. So I turn the turning of Indra; so I re-turn the turning of Āditya.' [5] (8.)

Then on the night of full moon, let him adore the moon when seen in the east [6] in the same manner, (saying), 'Soma, the king, art thou, the wise, the five-mouthed, Prajāpati. The Brāhmaṇa is one of thy mouths. With that mouth thou dost eat kings. With that mouth make me an eater of food. The king is one of thy mouths. With that mouth thou eatest the folk.[7] With that mouth make me an eater of food. The hawk is one of thy mouths. With that mouth thou eatest

[1] The scholiast's recension reads only 'on,' omitting *vṛttāyām*, which, however, need only mean 'having come,' as Deussen takes it.

[2] In that recension is read 'he shoots his voice in a blade of grass.' In the verse Deussen suggests *susīme* (voc.); Max Müller follows Saṅkarānanda in reading *te susīmaṃ hṛdayam adhi candramasi śritaṃ tenāmṛtasyeśāne*, as in iv, 10; cf. *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, p. cxx.

[3] I read *pūrvā prajā*. The plural is quite impossible in a case like this. So in iv, 10.

[4] RV., i, 91, 16 (= ix, 31, 4); 18; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, ii, 3, 5, 3; iv, 14, 1. Cf. also Atharva Veda, vii, 81, 6.

[5] i.e. the *pradakṣiṇa*, from west to east; cf. Caland & Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. xxxvii. In iv, 9, from east to west, Varuṇa being in the west. Indra's connection with the sun is noteworthy; cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, iii, 158 seq.; 207, n. 2; and for this passage, ibid., p. 280, n. 2; Caland, *Een Indogerm. Lustratiegebruik*, p. 10.

[6] In view of *paścāt* in iv, 8, this must be the sense. 'In front,' Śaṅkarānanda followed by Cowell.

[7] This recurrent phrase in the Brāhmaṇa texts is a clear reference to the king's right of maintenance by the common people; cf. Foy, *Die Königliche Gewalt*, p. 41.

birds. With that mouth make me an eater of food. The fire is one of thy mouths. With that mouth thou eatest this world. With that mouth make me an eater of food. In thyself is the fifth mouth. With that mouth thou eatest all creatures. With that mouth make me an eater of food. Do not diminish [1] with our lives, children, and cattle; he who hates us and whom we hate, diminish with his life, children, and cattle. So I turn the turning of the gods. So I re-turn the turning of Āditya.' So (saying), he revolves round his right arm. (9.)

Then, when he consorts [2] with his wife, let him touch her heart, (saying), 'What in thy fair heart rests within Prajāpati (the moon), through that, O mistress of immortality, mayst thou never weep for misfortune to thy children.' Her children die not before her. (10.)

Then, when coming back after absence, he should smell [3] the head of his son, (saying),[4] 'From each limb art thou born; from the heart thou dost spring; self indeed is thy name, son; live thou a hundred autumns, N. N.' So he utters his name. 'Be [5] thou a stone; be an axe; be [6] gold indestructible; splendour indeed is thy name, son; live thou a hundred autumns, N. N.' So he utters his name. Then he embraces him (saying [7]), 'Even as Prajāpati embraced creatures for their

[1] As in iv, 8, we must reject Saṅkarānanda's version, adopted by Cowell, which ignores the reference to the moon's waxing and waning, and renders 'gladden (us)' and 'destroy (us)' or 'our enemy' respectively, a construction rendered impossible by the form of the relative clause alone. The difference in the ideas is remarkable, though not contradictory; lives are instruments in the first case, objects of comparison in the second; cf. Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 218, n. 7; *Sechzig Upanishad's*, pp. 34, 35. For the destruction of the world, cf. Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, pp. 219 seq.

[2] Read probably *saṃviśyan* (fourth class from *viś*), or °*vekṣyan*, as suggested by Deussen. In the verse *susīme* may be voc., as Deussen takes it. The Berlin MS. has *hṛdayam*. Śaṅkarānanda mentions the v.l. *manye 'haṃ māṃ tadvidvāṃsaṃ māham*, and reads *na hāsmāt*; cf. iv, 8.

[3] See Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xxviii, 120–34, an amusing and important sketch. The scholiast's recension has °*mṛśet*, a much inferior reading.

[4] See reff. in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 33b.

[5] Ibid., p. 126a.

[6] Ibid., p. 1068b. 'Solid,' Max Müller; 'unscattered,' Deussen; 'widely scattered,' Saṅkarānanda.

[7] Śaṅkarānanda has, 'he utters his name.'

safety, so do I embrace thee, N. N.' Then he mutters in his right ear, 'To him,[1] O bounteous one, O onrusher, giver'; 'O Indra,[2] bestow the best riches,' in his left; 'Be not divided;[3] be not troubled; live a hundred autumns of life; O son, I smell thy head with thy name, N. N.'[4] So (saying), let him thrice smell his head. (Saying), 'I low over thee with the lowing of kine,' thrice let him low over his head. (11.)

Then comes the dying round of the deities. This[5] Brahman (n.) shines forth when the fire blazes. Then it dies when the fire blazes not. Its splendour goes to the sun, its breath to the wind. This Brahman shines forth when the sun is seen. Then it dies when the sun is not seen. Its splendour goes to the moon, its breath to the wind. This Brahman shines forth when the moon is seen. Then it dies when the moon is not seen. Its splendour goes to the lightning, its breath to the wind. This Brahman shines forth when the lightning flashes. Then it dies when the lightning flashes not. Its splendour goes to the quarters,[6] its breath to the wind. All these deities indeed, having entered the wind, having died in the wind, die not. Therefore they arise again.

So much as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. (12.)

This Brahman(n.) shines forth when one speaks with speech. Then it dies when one does not speak. Its[7] splendour goes to the eye, its breath to the breath. This Brahman shines forth when one sees with the eye. Then it dies when one sees not. Its splendour goes to the ear, its breath to the breath. This Brahman shines forth when one hears with the

[1] *Asme* in RV., iii, 36, 10.

[2] RV., ii, 21, 6.

[3] Read *mā bhetthā mā vyathiṣṭhāḥ*, of which other readings are only misunderstandings, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 388. Max Müller renders *chetthāḥ*, 'do not cut off (the line of our race).'

[4] Saṅkarānanda takes *asau* as nom. But the sense requires a voc.; see Whitney, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, p. lxxi. Cowell's text is here defective.

[5] i.e. breath. For this *parimara*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii, 28; Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 108; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, iii, 10, 4.

[6] As the abodes of wind. The scholiast's recension has actually *vāyum*, which Deussen prefers, and Max Müller renders.

[7] We need not read, with Deussen, *tasyāḥ*, for the identification is thorough.

ear. Then it dies when one does not hear. Its splendour goes to the mind, its breath to the breath. This Brahman shines when one thinks by the mind. Then it dies when one does not think. Its splendour goes to the breath, its breath to the breath. All these deities indeed, having entered the breath, having died in the breath, die not. Therefore they arise again. Thus even if the two mountains,[1] the south and the north, should advance against one who knows this eager to destroy him, they would destroy him not. But those who hate him and whom he himself hates die round him. (13.)

Then follows the gaining of pre-eminence.[2] These deities, disputing on their pre-eminence, went forth from this body. Then it lay, without breath, dry, a mere log. Then speech entered it, and it spoke, but still lay. Then the eye entered it, but it lay, speaking with speech, seeing with the eye. Then the ear entered it, but it lay, speaking with speech, seeing with the eye, hearing with the ear. Then mind entered it, but it lay, speaking with speech, seeing with the eye, hearing with the ear, thinking with mind. Then breath entered it. Then it arose. Then all the deities, recognising the superiority of breath, having entered[3] into breath, the intellectual self, went forth from the body with all these[4] (organs). They entered into the wind, and, identified with the ether, went to heaven. Even so a man who knows this, recognising the pre-eminence of breath, having entered into breath, the intellectual self, goes forth from the body with all these (organs). He enters into the wind, and, identified with the ether, goes to heaven. He goes then where the gods are. As the gods became immortal, so does he become immortal who knows this. (14.)

[1] Written in the Madhyadeśa, but we need not suppose, with Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 408, before the South was known. Cf. on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 1, 1.

[2] Cf. v, 3; ix; Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, vi, 2, 7–15; Chāndogya Upaniṣad, v, 1, 6–12; Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 1, 4; 4, 3; Praśna Upaniṣad, ii, 2–4; Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, pp. 104, 105. I agree with his estimate of the place of the Kauṣītaki, but not of the Aitareya.

[3] This is the sense of *abhisaṃbhū*, not 'honoured,' as Cowell; 'comprehended,' Max Müller. Śaṅkarānanda has *vāyupratiṣṭhāḥ*.

[4] Scil. *indriyaiḥ*, over which the deities preside; the five Prāṇas, Śaṅkarānanda, Deussen, and Max Müller.

Then follows the tradition from father to son. Thus do they set it forth. The father, when about to die, calls for his son. After strewing the house with fresh grass, and laying the fire, and placing a pot of water with a jar (of rice), he lies clothed in a new garment. The son comes and approaches him from above, having touched all his organs with his own. Or he may perform the tradition for (his son) seated in front of him. 'My speech I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy speech I place in me,' says the son. 'My breath[1] I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy breath I place in me,' says the son. 'Mine eye I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thine eye I place in me,' says the son. 'Mine ear I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thine ear I place in me,' says the son. 'My savour of food I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy savour of food I place in me,' says the son. 'My deeds I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy deeds I place in me,' says the son. 'My good and evil hap I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy good and evil hap I place in me,' says the son. 'My joy, dalliance, and offspring I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy joy, dalliance, and offspring I place in me,' says the son. 'My going I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy going I place in me,' says the son. 'My mind[2] I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy mind I place in me,' says the son. 'Mine intelligence I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thine intelligence I place in me,' says the son. If then he should be very ill, he should speak summarily. 'My breaths I will place in thee,' says the father. 'Thy breaths I place in me,' says the son. Then, after going round his father with his right side towards him, he departs. His father cries after him, 'May glory, holiness, suitable food,[3] and fame attend thee.' Then the other looks back over his left shoulder hiding (his face) with his hand or covering it with the hem of his

[1] No doubt in the sense of 'smell.' *Ghrāṇam* is possible. For the whole, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, i, 5, 25 seq. (= 17 seq. K.).
[2] The scholiast's recension reads *dhiyo vijñātavyaṃ kāmān* (as in iii, 7), and omits the rest down to *atha*. That recension also makes the father approach the son, while Cowell's MS. A adds after 'deeds' 'the body.'
[3] Omitted in Cowell's text.

garment, (saying), 'Obtain the worlds of heaven, thy desires.' If the father recover, let him live in his son's control, or let him wander about (as an ascetic). If, however, he die, let them provide for him, as he should be provided for.[1] (15.)

Adhyāya V.

Pratardana Daivodāsi went to Indra's loved abode through war and courage. Indra said to him, 'Pratardana, choose a boon.' Pratardana said, 'Do thou choose for me what boon thou thinkest best for man.' Indra said to him, 'The superior[2] chooses not for the inferior. Choose thyself.' 'Then hast thou no boon[3] for me,' said Pratardana. Then Indra deviated not from truth, for Indra is truth. Indra said to him, 'Me only know. That I deem best for man that he should know me. The offspring of Tvaṣṭṛ,[4] the three-headed, I slew; I gave to the wolves the devotees, the Arunmukhas; breaking many a compact, I crushed the Prahlādīyas in heaven, the Paulomas in the atmosphere, the Kālakāñjas on the earth, and then not a hair of me was harmed. He who knows me, his life to come is harmed by no deed whatsoever, neither by theft, nor slaying the babe unborn,[5] nor by slaying his mother,

[1] The reference is, I think, to the funeral rites, as taken by Max Müller. Cowell renders 'receive the tradition'; Deussen, 'the powers of the father take possession of him.' Saṅkarānanda seems to have read *enaṃ samāpayati*.

[2] The scholiast's recension has *varaḥ parasmai*, and the Berlin MS. has *varo parasmai*. The true reading is, I think, not *varo 'varasmai*, but *varo 'parasmai*.

[3] Deussen inverts the names Indra and Pratardana, and so can render 'thou art lower than I' possible in Indra's mouth. Cowell gives as alternatives, 'Let not the inferior choose' and 'Let not the boon become no boon.' Max Müller has, 'No one who chooses, chooses for another; choose thyself . . . that boon to choose is no boon for me.' I take *meti* as an irregular contraction for *ma iti*; cf. *udgīthopa°* in iii, 5. *A-vara* must, I think, contain a reference to some appeal to Indra's love of truth; hence my rendering.

[4] For the following, cf. Sāyaṇa on RV., v, 34, 4; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii, 28; and other passages in Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 410 seq.; iii, 464, 465; xiii, 191 seq. The mythological sense, if any, is hopelessly lost, except in the case of Tvāṣṭra, Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 160. Indra's *kilbiṣāṇi* are famed in the Brāhmaṇa period. The Berlin MS. has *aruṅmukhān*.

[5] Not 'slaying a Brāhmaṇa,' as Weber, Cowell, with the scholiast, and Max Müller. The scholiast's recension has a clause more.

nor by slaying his father. Nor when he has done[1] evil does the bloom leave his face.' (1.)

He said, 'I am breath. Worship me as the intelligent self, as life, as immortality. Life is breath; breath is life, for as long as breath dwells in the body, so long does life. For by breath he obtains immortality in this[2] world, by intelligence, truth,[3] and will. He, who worships me as life and immortality, enjoys full length of days in this world and obtains immortality and imperishableness in the world of heaven.'[4] Some say, 'The breaths become one. For else no one could at one time make known a name by speech, a form by the eye, a sound by the ear, a thought by the mind. The breaths having become one make known all these one by one. When speech speaks, all the breaths speak after it; when the eye sees, all the breaths see after it; when the ear hears, all the breaths hear after it; when the mind thinks, all the breaths think after it; when the breath breathes, all the breaths breathe after it.' 'Even so it is,' said Indra; 'there is, however, a highest of the breaths.' (2.)

One lives though deprived of speech, for we see the dumb. One lives though deprived of sight, for we see the blind. One lives though deprived of hearing, for we see the deaf. One lives though deprived of mind, for we see infants. One lives though one's arms are lost, or when one's legs are lost, for we see it so.[5] Breath alone is the intelligent self.

[1] *Veti* cannot be correct, for *vī* does not mean 'go away.' Read *vyeti* as in Taittirīya Saṃhitā, iii, 1, 1, 2, *nāsya nīlam na haro vyeti*. The *cakrṣo* of Saṅkarānanda and the edd. is impossible. The Berlin MS. has *cakṣuṣo*, and the correct reading is obviously *cakruṣo*; so Deussen and two of the Ānand. MSS. The Berlin MS. adds *cana*. The substantial immorality of this doctrine remains a fatal difficulty in Vedāntism as in the Sāṃkhya.

[2] The scholiast's recension reads 'in the other'; so Max Müller. That recension has, 'Breath is life, breath too is immortality,' which Max Müller adopts and expands.

[3] 'True resolve,' Cowell; 'true knowledge,' Deussen and Max Müller.

[4] Saṅkarānanda makes Pratardana commence here to speak. This seems unnecessary, though adopted by Cowell, Deussen, and Max Müller, who at the end suggests *prāṇasya* for the plural, but it is not necessary.

[5] Apparently a reference to mutilation as a punishment. Cf. Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, 134. The 'mind' sentence is omitted in the scholiast's recension in some MSS.

Encompassing the body it raises it up; therefore should one worship it as the hymn[1] (*uktha*). Thus is everything to be won in breath. What breath is, that is intelligence; what intelligence is, that is breath. This is its insight, its true knowledge. When then a man in sleep dreams no dreams, then his breath becomes one;[2] then speech with all names enters it; sight with all forms enters it; hearing with all sounds enters it; mind with all thoughts enters it. When he awakes, just as from a burning fire sparks leap to all the quarters, so from that self the breaths rise up according to their places; from the breaths the deities arise; from the deities the worlds. This breath[3] alone is the intelligent self. Encompassing the body it raises it up; therefore should one worship it as the hymn. Thus is everything to be won in breath. What breath is, that is intelligence; what intelligence is, that is breath. This is its insight, its true knowledge. When then a man, ill, on the point of death, and very weak, falls into a faint, they say, 'His thought has departed; he hears not, he sees not, he speaks not, he thinks not.' Then his breath becomes one; then speech with all names enters it; sight with all forms enters it; hearing with all sounds enters it; mind with all thoughts enters it. When he leaves the body he leaves it with all of these. (3.)

Speech and all names are deposited in him. By speech he obtains all names. Smell[4] and all odours are deposited in him. By smell he obtains all odours. Sight and all forms are deposited in him. By sight he obtains all forms. Hearing and all sounds are deposited in him. By hearing he obtains all sounds. Mind and all thoughts are deposited in him.

[1] *Uktha* from *ut-thāpayati*. The reference is, of course, to the Mahad Uktha of i and ii.

[2] Or 'he becomes one in breath'; cf. vi, 20; *S.B.E.*, xlviii, 378 seq. So Cowell, Deussen, and Max Müller (doubtfully). The scholiast's recension omits in the beginning of the sentence 'This . . . breath,' and adds 'They dwell together and depart together; this is its insight.'

[3] Omitted in the scholiast's recension.

[4] The usual variation in MSS. between *prāṇa* and *ghrāṇa*. Śaṅkarānanda has, 'Speech dismisses all names,' etc., and he inserts above, 'When he awakes,' etc., over again. Max Müller has, 'Speech gives up' or 'takes away' all names.

By mind he obtains all thoughts. Together[1] they dwell in the body; together they depart.

Now we will explain how all beings become one for this intelligence. (4.)

Speech is taken out[2] as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, the name, was placed outside. Smell was taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, the odour, was placed outside. Sight was taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, form, was placed outside. Hearing was taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, sound, was placed outside. The tongue was taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, the savour of food, was placed outside. The hands were taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with them a rudimentary element, action, was placed outside. The body was taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, pleasure and pain, was placed outside. The organ was taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, joy, dalliance, and offspring, was placed outside. The feet were taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with them a rudimentary element, motion, was placed outside. Mind[3] was taken out as one portion of it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, thought and desires, was placed outside. (5.)

Having mounted on speech with intelligence, he obtains, through speech, all names. Having mounted on smell with intelligence, he obtains, through smell, all odours. Having mounted on sight with intelligence, he obtains, through sight,

[1] This is preceded in the scholiast's recension by 'Thus is everything to be won in breath. What breath is, that is intelligence. What intelligence is, that is breath.' Cf. v, 3.

[2] We must read *udūḷham* (as Deussen and Max Müller) or *adūduhat* throughout (cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 388). There seem to have been early two readings, *udūḷham* and *adūduhat*, and possibly the second is merely a gloss on the first. *Adūḷham* is a meaningless contamination. The sense is, from intelligence come the five organs (=their activities, the two being identified) and their objects.

[3] The scholiast's recension has, 'Intelligence as one part was taken out from it; to correspond with it a rudimentary element, thought, what is to be known, desires, was placed outside.'

all forms. Having mounted on hearing with intelligence, he obtains, through hearing, all sounds. Having mounted on the tongue with intelligence, he obtains, through the tongue, all the savour of food. Having mounted on the hands with intelligence, he obtains, through the hands, all actions. Having mounted on the body with intelligence, he obtains, through the body, pleasure and pain. Having mounted on the organ with intelligence, he obtains, through the organ, joy, dalliance, and offspring. Having mounted on the feet with intelligence, he obtains, through the feet, motions. Having mounted on the mind[1] with intelligence, he obtains through the mind, all thoughts. (6.)

For, bereft of intelligence, speech could not make known any name. 'My mind has been somewhere else,' it says, 'I have not perceived that name.' For, bereft of intelligence, smell could not make known any odour. 'My mind has been somewhere else,' it says, 'I have not perceived that odour.' For, bereft of intelligence, sight could not make known any form. 'My mind has been somewhere else,' it says, 'I have not perceived any form.' For, bereft of intelligence, hearing could not make known any sound. 'My mind has been somewhere else,' it says, 'I have not perceived that sound.' For, bereft of intelligence, the tongue could not make known any savour of food. 'My mind has been somewhere else,' it says, 'I have not perceived that savour of food.' For, bereft of intelligence, the hands could not make known any action. 'Our mind has been somewhere else,' they[2] say, 'we have not perceived that action.' For, bereft of intelligence, the body could not make known any[3] pleasure or pain. 'My mind has been somewhere else,' it says, 'I have not perceived pleasure or pain.' For, bereft of intelligence, the organ could not make known any joy, dalliance, or offspring. 'My mind has been somewhere else,' it says, 'I have not perceived joy, dalliance, or offspring.'

[1] Śaṅkarānanda has, 'Mounting on thoughts with intelligence, he obtains, through intelligence, thoughts, what is to be known, desires.'

[2] Śaṅkarānanda keeps throughout the singular, 'One says,' and Deussen and Max Müller follow him.

[3] The *na* inserted in Cowell's MS. D is not necessary.

For, bereft of intelligence, the feet could not make known any motion. 'Our mind has been somewhere else,' they say, 'we have not perceived motion.' For, bereft of intelligence, no thought could be complete, nor what is to be known be known. (7.)

One should not seek to know speech, but the speaker one should know. One should not seek to know the odour, but the smeller one should know. One should not seek to know form, but the seer one should know. One should not wish to know sound, but the hearer one should know. One should not wish to know the savour of food, but the knower of the savour of food one should know. One should not seek to know the act, but the actor one should know. One should not seek to know pleasure and pain, but the knower of pleasure and pain one should know. One should not seek to know joy, dalliance, and offspring, but the knower of joy, dalliance, and offspring one should know. One should not desire to know motion, but the mover one should know. One should not desire to know the mind, but the thinker one should know. These ten rudimentary elements indeed depend on intelligence. The ten rudiments of intelligence depend on the elements. For if there were not the rudimentary elements there would not be the rudiments of intelligence, or if there were not the rudiments of intelligence there would not be the rudimentary elements, for from neither of the two by itself could any form be made. Nor again are they separate. Just as the rim of a chariot wheel is placed on the spokes, and the spokes are placed on the nave, so these rudimentary elements are placed upon the rudiments of intelligence, and the rudiments of intelligence are placed upon the breath. This breath is the intelligent self, joy,[1] unaging, immortal. It becomes not greater through a good deed, nor less through an evil deed. For him,[2] indeed, it causes to do

[1] Cowell's MS. D has *anantaḥ*, 'unending,' the usual variant. The use of the word in two quite different senses is strange, Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 144, and the variant may be correct. In the Berlin MS. the *da* is added later.

[2] The scholiast's recension has, 'whom he wishes to draw after him; and whom he wishes to draw away from these worlds.'

good deeds whom it desires to lead forth from these worlds. Him again it causes to do evil deeds whom it seeks to plunge below. This is the guardian of the world, the lord of the world, the ruler of the world; this is my soul; this let a man know. (8.)

Adhyāya VI.

Now Gārgya Bālāki was famous[1] as a student (of the Veda). He dwelt among the Uśīnaras, the Vaśas[2] and Matsyas, the Kurus and the Pañcālas, the Kāśis and the Videhas. He went up to Ajātaśatru of Kāśi and said, 'Let me expound Brahman(n.) to thee.' To him said Ajātaśatru, '"We give[3] thee a thousand (cows)," for that speech men run acclaiming, "Janaka, Janaka."' (1.)

(The spirit) in the sun, the great one; (the spirit) in the moon, food; (the spirit) in the lightning, truth; (the spirit) in the thunder-cloud, sound; (the spirit) in the wind, Indra Vaikuṇṭha; (the spirit) in the ether, the full; (the spirit) in fire, the irresistible; (the spirit) in the waters, splendour; as regards the deities (these[4] are the views as to Brahman of Bālāki and Janaka respectively). Then as regards the self. (The spirit) in the mirror, the reflection; (the spirit) in the shade, the double; (the spirit) in the echo, the life; (the

[1] This must be the sense of *saṃspaṣṭaḥ*. *Saṃspṛṣṭaḥ*, the v.l. of Cowell's MS. A and the Ānandāśrama, is not supported by my MSS. See the parallel version in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, ii, 1. This version omits the spirit in the quarters, but adds the spirits of thunder, echo, the right and the left eye, and *prajñā*, cf. Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, i, 301.

[2] See *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 367.

[3] I ascribe this to Janaka, *vāci* is the *nimittasaptamī*. I read *ta iti* with Cowell's MS. D and the Berlin and Bodleian MSS. Janaka's generosity takes people away from Ajātaśatru. If the words are given as Ajātaśatru's, as by Cowell (misunderstanding also Śaṅkarānanda's view of the sense), it is difficult to give a good meaning. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka has a different and perhaps better reading as rendered by Böhtlingk, 'We give a hundred cows for this speech, and people come around, saying, "(A second) Janaka, (a second) Janaka."' So here Deussen has, 'I give you a thousand cows; when this is said, people come with the cry,' etc. Cowell has, 'I give thee one thousand cows for those words of thine. Many are the persons who run hither (foolishly), crying, "Janaka, Janaka."' Max Müller, 'For verily all people run away, saying, "Janaka (the king of Mithilā), is our father (patron)."'

[4] A quasi Anukramaṇī, found in the scholiast's recension as section 18. Cowell omits it in his translation and renumbers the next sections.

spirit) in sound, death; (the spirit) in sleep, Yama; (the spirit) in the body, Prajāpati; (the spirit) in the right eye, (the self of speech; (the spirit) in the left eye, (the self) of truth. (2.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the sun.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not make me talk[1] of this. I worship him as the great one,[2] clothed in white, pre-eminent, the head of all beings.' He who worships him thus becomes pre-eminent, the head of all beings. (3.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the moon.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the self[3] of food.' He who worships him thus becomes the self of food. (4.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the lightning.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the self of truth.'[4] He who worships him thus becomes the self of truth. (5.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the thunder-cloud.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the self of sound.' He who worships him thus becomes the self of sound. (6.)

Bālāki[5] said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the wind.'

[1] Cowell renders, 'talk proudly'; Deussen, 'Thou shouldst not have called me to a discussion,' or, following the reading of the scholiast, *samavādayiṣṭhāḥ*, 'Thou shouldst not expect my agreement' (*samavāda*). The latter rendering is impossible, and the former unduly presses the sense of the negative aorist. 'Do not challenge,' Max Müller, who points out that Ajātaśatru shows his knowledge by supplying the predicates. He does not, however, add the rewards, as Max Müller says, these being statements by the writer of the text. Eggeling suggests 'argue.'

[2] Read, of course, *bṛhan pāṇḍaravāsāḥ*; *bṛhat*, though read even by Cowell and Max Müller, is nonsense, and *t* = *n* in most MSS. The scholiast's recension has *bṛhan*, so have the Berlin MS. (probably, but *bṛhac* in vi, 2) and Böhtlingk's ed. of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka. The secondary character of the Kauṣītaki version appears in this definition, which in the prototype applies to the moon. *Pāṇḍara* is the reading of the Berlin MS., and may be kept, as in the scholiast's recension and the Bṛhadāraṇyaka.

[3] The scholiast's recension has, 'As Soma, the king,' etc. Cf. vi, 19; Bṛhadāraṇyaka, ii, 1, 3. Probably these words should be read here as Deussen does, with Max Müller.

[4] That recension has, 'the self of splendour' (read *tejasa ātmā*); so Max Müller.

[5] Śaṅkarānanda's recension in some MSS. transposes sections 7 and 8.

Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as Indra Vaikuṇṭha,[1] the invincible host.' He who worships him thus becomes a conqueror, unconquerable by others, conquering others. (7.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the ether.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the full and actionless[2] Brahman(n.).' He who worships him thus is filled with children, health, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days.[3] (8.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in fire.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the irresistible.' He who worships him thus becomes irresistible among others.[4] (9.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the waters.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the self of splendour.'[5] He who worships him thus becomes the self of splendour.

So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. (10.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the mirror.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the reflection.' He who worships him thus, a reflection of him is born among his offspring, not a counterfeit. (11.)

Bālāki[6] said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the shadow.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as the second[7] and inseparable.' He who worships him thus obtains (his desire) from the double. For he becomes double. (12.)

[1] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, ii, 1, 6, probably the earliest occurrence of the epithet.

[2] Cf. Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 20, n. 3.

[3] Śaṅkarānanda has, 'is filled with children, cattle; neither he himself nor his children die before their time.'

[4] The scholiast's recension has *anv eṣa* for *anyeṣu*. All these clauses are not Ajātaśatru's as Cowell and Max Müller take them.

[5] That recension has, 'the self of a name' (*nāmna ātmā*); so Max Müller.

[6] The scholiast's recension has these sections in the order 13, 14, 12, 16, 15.

[7] That recension has, 'as death,' etc., as in 14, ending 'neither he himself nor his children perish before their time.' Deussen's reading *dvitīyān* (apparently in Cowell's MSS. F, G, not in the scholiast) is probably correct; Max Müller renders with Śaṅkarānanda, 'from the second (his wife).'

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the echo.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as life.'[1] He who worships him thus does not faint before his time. (13.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit[2] in sound.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as death.'[3] He who worships him thus does not die before his time. (14.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him who sleeping moves[4] in a dream.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as King Yama.' He who worships him thus, to him all this is subdued for his weal. (15.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the body.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me talk of this. I worship him as Prajāpati.' He who worships him thus is multiplied in children, cattle,[5] glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (16.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the right eye.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me speak of this. I worship him as the self of speech,[6] the self of fire, the self of light.' He who worships him thus becomes the self of all these. (17.)

Bālāki said, 'I worship him as the spirit in the left eye.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Do not, do not, make me speak of this. I worship him as the self of truth, the self of the lightning, the self of splendour.' He who worships him thus becomes the self of all these. (18.)[7]

[1] That recension has, 'as the second,' etc., as in 12.

[2] That recension has, 'who as sound follows the spirit.' So Max Müller, 'Nachrede,' Deussen.

[3] That recension has, 'as life,' etc., as in 13, ending 'neither he himself nor his children faint before their time.'

[4] That recension has, 'I worship the intelligent self by which the sleeper moves in a dream.' So Max Müller. Whether the reading is *svapnyayā* (Cowell's MS. A, Ānand., the Berlin and Bodleian MSS.) or *svapnayā*, the sense is the same, and Cowell's suggested *svapnay ācarati* is unnecessary.

[5] That recension omits the rest as in vi, 8; so Max Müller.

[6] The scholiast's recension has, 'of the name'; so Max Müller.

[7] The sections 3–18 in that recension are numbered 2–17, as the resumé in 2 occurs after 18 (17) joined on to 19 (18).

Then held Bālāki his peace. Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Thus far only, Bālāki?' Bālāki replied, 'Thus far only.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Make me not (again)[1] to talk vainly, (saying), "Let me teach thee Brahman(n.)." He who, Bālāki, is the maker of these spirits, of whom this is the work, he it is who must be known.' Then Bālāki came to him with fuel in hand, (saying), 'Let me approach thee.' Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Contrary to nature do I deem it that a Kṣatriya should instruct a Brāhmaṇa. Yet come, I will instruct you.' Taking him by the hand he set forth. They came to a man asleep. Then Ajātaśatru hailed him,[2] 'O great one, clothed in white, Soma, the King.' He still lay (asleep[3]). He then touched him with his staff. He then rose up. Ajātaśatru said to him, 'Where, Bālāki, has lain the spirit (asleep), where has this taken place, whence has this returned?' Bālāki then did not know.[4] Ajātaśatru said to him, '(This is) where has lain the spirit (asleep), where this has taken place, whence this has returned. The veins named Hitā stretch from the heart to the pericardium; slender as a hair divided into a thousand parts, they are filled with minute atoms of brown,[5] white, black, yellow, and red.[6] In them (the sleeper) dwells when he has no dreams. (19.)

'Then breath in him becomes one.[7] Speech with all names enters it. Sight with all forms enters it. Hearing with all sounds enters it. Mind with all thoughts enters it. When he awakes, just as from a burning fire sparks fly to all the quarters, so from this self the breaths proceed

[1] *Saṃvādayiṣṭhāḥ* cannot legitimately be made intransitive, as in Cowell's translation, and the sense with this reading must be as given. I prefer the reading of the scholiast's recension; *samavādayiṣṭhāḥ*, 'thou hast caused me fruitless talk'; so Max Müller and Deussen. The error in the MSS. is easy in view of the preceding clauses.

[2] Read *bṛhan* with Śaṅkarānanda and Bṛhadāraṇyaka, ii, 1, 15. Cf. p. 37, n. 2.

[3] The scholiast's recension has 'silent.'

[4] That recension ends its section 18 here, and combines the rest of 19 (18) with 20. The Ānand. ed. differs, however, and follows in the main the divisions of the ordinary text.

[5] 'Various colours,' Cowell and Max Müller, needlessly.

[6] *Iti* here enumerates; above, p. 8, n. 6; below, p. 51, n. 6.

[7] Or, 'Then is he absorbed in that Prāṇa' (Cowell, Deussen, Max Müller).

forth according to their stations. From the breaths arise the deities, from the deities the worlds. This breath, the intelligent self, enters into the compound self up to the hair, up to the nails. Just as a razor is placed in a razor-case, or fire in a receptacle of fire,[1] so this intelligent self enters into the corporeal self up to the hair, up to the nails. That self these selves depend on, as his dependants on a rich man.[2] Just as a rich man feeds on [3] his dependants, or his dependants feed on a rich man, so the intelligent self feeds on these selves, or so these selves feed on him. So long as Indra did not know this self, so long had the Asuras the mastery over him. When he knew this self, having slain and conquered the Asuras, he obtained superiority, sovereign control, and lordship over all gods and all beings.[4] Even so one who knows this, smiting away all evils, obtains superiority, sovereign control, and lordship over all beings,[5] one who knows this.' (20.)

Adhyāya VII.

Om.[6] I shall proclaim the right, I shall proclaim the true. May that avail me; may that avail the speaker; may it avail me; may it avail the speaker. In me be radiance; in me greatness. Speech rests on my mind; my mind on speech. Be thou revealed to me, that [7] art hidden in Veda

[1] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, i, 4, 7. 'Wood,' Cowell, Deussen; 'fireplace,' Max Müller. *Kṣura* may mean blade only, Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xvii, 61, 79.

[2] Possibly a *sheth* is already meant. Cf. Hopkins, *India, Old and New*, pp. 169 seq.

[3] Śaṅkarānanda, ignorant of the Vedic idiom (Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, v, 132), renders 'eats with,' followed by Cowell, Deussen, and Max Müller.

[4] This clause is omitted in the scholiast's recension, and also in the Berlin MS., where, however, the previous *ca* shows the slip, and indicates the process by which that recension arose.

[5] Vidyāraṇya, *Sarvopaniṣadarthānubhūtiprakāśa*, ix, 67, points out the pun on Ajātaśatru's name.

[6] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 1, 1, note; ii, 7, note; Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, ix, 19.

[7] The parallel versions show much divergence, but *tsāriṇīr* may be an irregular nom. (cf. v.l. in xi, 8), and it makes a good contrast to *āvir*. The words are given in the Śānti prefixed and appended to the Upaniṣad in the Ānand. ed. as *āvir maryo 'bhūr vedasā matsāṇīr*, with a commentary of which it is sufficient to say that *āṇīr* is treated as a verbal form. The corruption (cf. v.l. in my ed.) is apparently too deep-seated for

and Sāman. Right, hurt me not. I spend day and night in learning this. Agni, honour and oblation, honour and oblation; honour be there to the Ṛṣis who made the Mantras, who are lords of the Mantras, to the gods. May Sarasvatī be propitious, bearing favour, and kindly to us. May we not be severed from thy sight. Mind undeceived, living eye, sun best of lights. Consecration, harm me not. (1.)

Then follows the Saṃhitā Upaniṣad. 'Earth is the symbol of the former, the sky of the latter. Wind is the union,' says Śauravīra Māṇḍūkeya. 'Ether is the union,' Māṇḍavya taught in this connection,[1] 'for it is not considered independent, and so I have not agreed with his son.' Āgastya says, 'It is independent.' So wind and ether are the same.[2] So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. 'Speech is the symbol of the former, mind the form of the latter. Breath is the union,' says Śauravīra Māṇḍūkeya. Then his son, Dīrgha (the tall one), says, 'By mind he first proclaims, then speaks with speech. Therefore is mind the symbol of the former, speech of the latter. The union is mind, speech, and breath.' This chariot, drawn by horses, with a triple yoke, compact of mind, speech, and breath, bears (man) to the world of heaven. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. So the Māṇḍūkeyas. (2.)[3]

Then follows (the doctrine) of Śākalya. The earth is the symbol of the former, the heaven of the latter. The wind is the union; the rain is the junction, Parjanya the joiner. When a great cloud rains mightily and unceasing, (they say),

cure. Below *vyoma* is equally nonsense, but the parallel passages (cited in my ed.) show the sense given in the trans., which differs entirely from that in the commentary in the Ānand. or on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 7 (q.v.).

[1] *Asya*, vague as in Aitareya, iii, 1, 1. Cf. Uvaṭa on Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, Max Müller's ed., p. vi, and again in viii, 1. To render it 'him' is possible, but rather strained, with a causative.

[2] *Pituś ca putrasya ca* has no sense here, and is a misplacement of a remark which in the fuller version of the Aitareya, iii, 1, 1, where see my note, has a place, but not here.

[3] Followed in the MSS. by an Anukramaṇī of contents, not translated, as it consists merely of the first words in each case. Cf. vi, 2, which is, however, a real summary.

'Heaven and earth have joined together.' So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. This person is all egg-shaped. There are two halves. In it this is the symbol of the former, this of the latter. Between them here is this ether, just as there is that ether between heaven and earth. In this ether breath is stretched, just as in that ether wind is stretched. As those are those three lights, so there are these three lights. As there is that sun in the heaven, so there is this eye in the head. As there is that lightning in the atmosphere, so there is this heart in the body. As there is this fire on earth, so there is this seed in the organ. Thus, as it were, having compared the body (with the macrocosm) in all points, he says, 'This is the symbol of the former, this of the latter.' The union is mind, speech, and breath. This chariot drawn by horses, with a triple yoke, compact of mind, speech, and breath, bears (man) to the world of heaven. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (3.)[1]

'The earth is the symbol of the former, the heaven of the latter. Wind is the union, the quarters the junction, the sun the joiner,' says Viśvāmitra. So far as regards the gods. Now as regards the self. Speech is the symbol of the former, mind of the latter. Breath is the union, the ear the junction, the eye the joiner. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (4.)

'Fire is the symbol of the former, the moon of the latter. Lighting is the union,' says Sūryadatta. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. Speech is the symbol of the former, mind of the latter. Truth is the union. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (5.)

'The earth is the symbol of the former,[2] the heaven of the

[1] Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 2, where there is nothing corresponding to 4–7 here, and the names of the authorities of these sections do not seem genuine, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 371, 372.

[2] Cf. Rādha in the Vaṃśa Brāhmaṇa, *Ind. Stud.*, iv, 373, 384.

latter. Time is the union,' says Rādheya. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. Speech is the symbol of the former, mind of the latter. The self is the union. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (6.)

'Speech is the symbol of the former, mind of the latter. Knowledge is the union,' says Pauṣkarasādi. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (7.)

Then follow the imprecations.[1] One should know that breath is the beam. If one who calls this breath the beam should revile another, if he think himself strong, he says,[2] 'Thou hast grasped breath, the beam. Thou canst not be fain to grasp breath, the beam.' Then he should say to him, 'Breath, the beam, will forsake thee.' Again, if he think himself weak, he should say, 'Thou hast been fain to grasp breath, the beam. That thou hast not been able to grasp. Breath, the beam, will forsake thee.' But whatever, whether speaking or not,[3] he says to him, it is certain that it shall be accomplished. He should not, however, say anything save what is favourable to a Brāhmaṇa. Only in exceeding prosperity may he speak thus to a Brāhmaṇa. 'Not even[4] in exceeding prosperity. Let there be honour to Brāhmaṇas,' says Śauravīra Māṇḍūkeya. (8.)

If another[5] revile him who calls breath the beam, if he think him strong, he says, 'I have been fain to grasp

[1] Neither in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 4, nor here, is the sequence of thought or construction perfectly satisfactory, nor can it be made so without violent emendation or interpretation. The easiest change is to read *samadhām* for *samadhāḥ*, 'I have grasped,' which gives a closer parallel to vii, 9.

[2] This *āha* (so emended for the *ārtha* of the MSS.) is strange, but is already in the Aitareya.

[3] Apparently, whether cursing or not, his words, if he knows breath as the beam, come true.

[4] For the error of the MSS., *na ca* for *ca na*, cf. Mbh., xii, 21, 7, corrected by Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xxiii, 119. The locative has probably a causal sense (*nimittasaptamī*), 'because of excessive prosperity.' Cf. vi, 1; vii, 19, and note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 6.

[5] *Paraḥ* must be read to make sense. Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 4.

breath, the beam; thou canst not be fain to grasp it.' Then he should say to him, 'Breath, the beam, will forsake thee.' Again, if he think him weak, he should say to him, 'Thou hast been fain to grasp breath, the beam. That thou hast not been able to grasp. Breath, the beam, will forsake thee.' But whatever, whether speaking or not,[1] he says to him, it is certain that it shall be accomplished. He should not, however, say anything save what is favourable to a Brāhmaṇa. Only in exceeding prosperity may he speak thus to a Brāhmaṇa. 'Not even in exceeding prosperity. Let there be honour to Brāhmaṇas,' says Śauravīra Māṇḍūkeya. (9.)

Then follow the declarers of the Nirbhuja.[2] The Nirbhuja rests on earth, the Pratṛṇṇa on heaven, the Ubhayamantareṇa on the atmosphere. If a man who recites the Nirbhuja revile another, he should say to him, 'Thou hast offended earth, the deity; earth, the deity, will punish thee.' If a man who recites the Pratṛṇṇa revile another, he should say to him, 'Thou hast offended heaven, the deity; heaven, the deity, will punish thee.' If a man who recites the Ubhayamantareṇa revile another, he should say thus to him, 'Thou hast offended the atmosphere, the deity; the atmosphere, the deity, will punish thee.' For when he manifests the Sandhi, that is the form of the Nirbhuja; when he utters the two syllables in their natural form, that is the form of the Pratṛṇṇa and the original;[3] in the Ubhayamantareṇa both are included. He who desires proper food should recite the Nirbhuja; who desires heaven, the Pratṛṇṇa; who desires both, the Ubhayamantareṇa. Again, if he who recites the Nirbhuja revile another,[4] he

[1] i.e. whether he reviles or not.

[2] Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 3, from which, as in the case of 8 and 9 above, there are considerable differences.

[3] So Sāyaṇa on Aitareya, l.c., renders *agra u*, and it may be correct. The Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, p. vi (ed. Max Müller), has:

saṃdher vivartanaṃ nirbhujaṃ vadanti śauddhākṣaroccāraṇaṃ ca pratṛṇṇam || 3 ||
ubhayamantareṇobhayaṃ vyāptam agre pare kāmā annanākobhayāḥ |

[4] In the Aitareya these curses are only for reply, and the last sentence as to their being no possibility of blaming a reciter of the Ubhayamantareṇa is therefore in place; more so than here, where the reciter is active in cursing. In both 9 and 10 the reading *bruvantaṃ para* for *bruvan param* renders the sense much simpler.

should say to him, 'Thou hast fallen from the two lower stations.' If he who recites the Pratṛṇṇa revile another, he should say to him, 'Thou hast fallen from the two higher places.' But for him who recites the Ubhayamantareṇa there is no rebuke possible. But whatever, whether speaking or not, he says to him, it is certain that it shall be accomplished. He should not, however, say anything save what is favourable to a Brāhmaṇa. Only in exceeding prosperity may he speak thus to a Brāhmaṇa. 'Not even in exceeding prosperity. Let there be honour to Brāhmaṇas,' says Śauravīra Māṇḍūkeya. (10.)

Then the reciters of the Nirbhuja[1] say, 'The first syllable is the symbol of the former, the latter of the latter. That which is between the letters *y* and *v* is the union.' He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (11.)

'Then we say, "we are reciters of the Nirbhuja,"' says Hrasva Māṇḍūkeya, 'the first syllable is the symbol of the former, the latter of the latter. The mora between the former and latter forms, that by which one makes distinct[2] the Sandhi, that by which one distinguishes what is a mora and what is not, that by which one distinguishes accent from accent,[3] that is the union.' He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (12.)

Then says his son Madhyama, the son of Prātibodhī, who lived in Magadha,[4] 'The first syllable is the symbol of the former, the latter of the latter. The mora which declares the

[1] For 11–13, cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 5.
[2] Here and above *vivartayati* is ambiguous. 'Produces' seems best; possibly 'separates,' 'distinguishes'; cf. Max Müller, *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, p. vi.
[3] 'Accent and unaccented' in the Aitareya.
[4] The reference to Magadha denotes its somewhat unbrahminical character, and suggests that in the difficult passage, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 1, 1, there should be read *Vaṅgā-Magadhāś Cerapādāḥ* as names of the outcaste peoples, for the *vaṅgāvagadhāś* of the MSS. For the question of these tribes, cf. Pargiter, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 851–3. For the confusion of *v* and *m*, cf. Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, p. xcvii, and Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, i, 223, and cf. Atharva Veda, v, 22, 14.

Sandhi is the gliding. I recognise the gliding as the union.' That is declared in a Ṛc:—[1]

'Give us not up to those who, foes in ambuscade, are greedy for the wealth of him who sits at ease,
Who cherish in their heart abandonment of gods. Bṛhaspati, the Sāman is the highest known.'[2]

He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (13.)

'Speech is united with breath,' says Kauṇṭharavya,[3] 'breath with the blowing (air), the blowing (air) with the all-gods, the all-gods with the world of heaven, the world of heaven with Brahman. This is the progressive union.' He who knows thus this union, even so is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven, like this progressive union. If, at the instigation of another or for his own sake, he recites, then in reciting he should know 'The union has gone to heaven; of him who knows the gods,[4] so will it be for his reciting.' This, indeed, is it by this progress. (14.)

'The mother is the form of the former, the father of the latter. The child is the union,' says Bhārgava. All that is declared to be one. For the mother and the father and the child are this all. This is the Aditi union. For Aditi is this all, whatever this universe is. This is declared in a Ṛc:—[5]

'Aditi is the heaven, Aditi atmosphere, Aditi is the mother, the father, and the son,
Aditi is all gods, Aditi the five races, Aditi all that hath been born and shall be born.'

[1] RV., ii, 23, 16; Geldner, *Ved. Stud.*, iii, 68.
[2] The latter part of the verse is artificially interpreted.
[3] For 14–16, cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 6. For Kauṇṭharavya and Bhārgava, see *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 371; a Bhārgava occurs as Vaidarbhi in Praśna Upaniṣad, i, 1.
[4] This is the most probable construction of this obscure text, though *viduṣo devān* might be acc., 'to the knowing gods.'
[5] RV., i, 89, 10 (adapted from Griffiths' trans.).

He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (15.)

'The wife is the symbol of the former, the husband of the latter. The son is the union, the seed the joining, the begetting the joiner,'[1] says Sthavira Sākalya. This is the Prajāpati union. He who knows thus this union is increased[2] with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (16.)

'Offspring is the symbol of the former, faith[3] of the latter. Action is the union, truth the joiner,' says Kāśyapa. This is the truth union. They say the gods are of true unions.[4] He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (17.)

'Speech is the union,' says Pañcālacaṇḍa. By speech, indeed, the Vedas are united, by speech the metres, by speech he unites friends. When he studies or speaks, then breath is in speech, then speech absorbs breath. Again, when he sleeps or is silent, then speech is in breath, then breath absorbs speech; they absorb each other. This is declared in a Ṛc:—[5]

> 'One of these birds hath passed into the sea of air; thence he looks round and views this universal world.
> With simple heart I have beheld him close at hand; his mother him absorbs, and her he too absorbs.'

Speech, indeed, is the mother, breath the child. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days.[6] (18.)

[1] *Saṃdhānam* after *saṃdhiḥ* must be the agent, which persists in the result.

[2] *Prajāyate* here for the play on Prajāpati.

[3] On *śraddhā*, cf. Ludwig, *Ṛgveda*, iii, 262–5; Oldenberg's article, *Z.D.M.G.*, l, 448; *A.J.P.*, xvii, 408. It is more intellectual than the later Bhakti, but it is its lineal predecessor.

[4] Cf. Atharva Veda, xi, 6, 19. 20; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, i, 6, 7.

[5] RV., x, 114, 4.

[6] For 18, 19, cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 6; for the Sāmans, Hillebrandt, *Rom. Forsch.*, v, 316–20; Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xli, pp. xiv seq.

'The union is made by the symbol of Bṛhat and Rathantara,' says Tārkṣya. Speech, indeed, is the symbol of the Rathantara, breath of the Bṛhat. By both, indeed, is the union made, by speech and breath. For the sake of this Upaniṣad one watches cows for a year,' says[1] Tārkṣya. 'For the sake of just this one watches cows for a year,' says Tārkṣya. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (19.)

'Movement is the symbol of the former, stopping of the latter. Rest is the union,' says Jāratkārava Ārtabhāga.[2] In this union there are united *dhvaṃsis*,[3] *nimeṣas*, *kāṣṭhās*, seconds, minutes, hours, days and nights, half-months, months, seasons, and years. This union unites these times; time unites movement, stopping, and rest. By movement, stopping, and rest, all this is united. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. The past is the symbol of the former, the future of the latter. The present is the union. This is the time union. This is declared in a Ṛc:—[4]

'Great is that secret name, and far extending, whereby thou madest all present and future.
The light he loveth that was made aforetime, the five tribes whom he loveth well have entered.'

He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (20.)

Then follows the saying of Vāliśikhāyani.[5] 'There are, then,

[1] In the Aitareya he is said to guard the cows, presumably a more primitive view than that which merely makes him the authority.

[2] Cf. for him, Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iii, 2, 1.

[3] *Dhvaṃsi* is a special term of this school, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 373. The exact relations are unknown. In the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xiv, 81 and 82, the *nimeṣa* is a tenth of a *muhūrta* (a thirtieth of a day) and a *dhvaṃsi* a tenth of a *nimeṣa*. The words 'seconds . . hours' are *kalāḥ kṣaṇāḥ muhūrtāḥ*. See Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xxiv, 13.

[4] RV., x, 55, 2.

[5] Cf., for the teaching, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 6. The name is new and late, and the teaching itself raises the question of the relation of this text to the Sāṃkhya system, which recognises the *tanmātras* and the mixed character of the Mahābhūtas, see Garbe, *Sāṃkhya Philosophie*, pp. 237, 239, and Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, pp. 193 seq. We need not, however, assume that this passage is borrowed from the Sāṃkhya. If Deussen exaggerates the certainty of the derivation from the Vedānta of that system, Garbe equally exaggerates the character of its revolt (op. cit.,

five gross elements,' says Vāliśikhāyani, 'the earth, wind, ether, water, light. These are united with each other. Again, the others, the small ones, are united with the gross elements. This is the union of all elements. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. (21.)

'The whole of speech is Brahman,' says Lauhikya.[1] Whatever sounds there are, let him know to be speech. This a Ṛṣi declares:—[2]

'I with the Rudras and the Vasus fare.'

This speech is all sounds. He who knows thus this union is united with children, cattle, glory, holiness, the world of heaven. He lives all his days. And even as Brahman(n.) can change form at will and move at will, so among all beings can he change form and move at will who knows thus. (22.)

Adhyāya VIII.

Om. 'Breath is the beam,' says Sthavira Śākalya. 'Just as all the other beams rest on the main-beam, so the whole self rests on this breath. Of this self breath is the symbol of the sibilants, the bones of the mutes, the marrow of the vowels, the flesh and blood, the fourth element, of the semi-vowels.'[3] 'But

pp. 5–20), and the *tanmātra* conception has no necessary connection with the fundamental view of either system, while the Vedānta adopts it in the physiology of the self. The mistake of Garbe's view of the Paurāṇic Sāṃkhya (pp. 53 seq.) and of the Bhagavadgītā (cf. his trans., Leipzig, 1905, and Hopkins' review, *J.R.A.S.*, 1905, pp. 384–9) seems to me to lie in not recognising the great part played in all Vedic and Hindu religion by Bhakti, which is accompanied by a quasi-theistic, quasi-pantheistic, conception of philosophy, such as is made explicit in the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja, see *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, pp. 490 seq.; Grierson, ibid., 1908, p. 361. The issue is not so much between pantheism and theism, which indeed tend to blend into each other, but between atheism as in the Sāṃkhya and Buddhism, Advaitism as in Saṅkara, and the Dvaitism of the Bhāgavatas, Pāśupatas, etc., who *de facto* are pantheists, since in a sense all is in God, theists since God is the object of devotion and individual souls seek Him, yet are not merged in or identical with Him, and who believe in the real existence of the world. Cf. Vijñānabhikṣu's Sāṃkhya-pravacanabhāṣya (Garbe, op. cit., pp. 75–7, 115); Thibaut, *S.B.E.*, xxxiv, pp. xcvii seq.

[1] Perhaps Lauhitya, cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 372, n. 1; Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad, iii, 42, 1 (a Vaṃśa).

[2] RV., x, 125, 1.

[3] The parallel version, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 2, 1, has *antasthārūpam*, and this gives the sense.

we have heard of a triad only,' says Hrasva Māṇḍūkeya. Of this triad, on one side there are three hundred and sixty joinings, on the other the same; these make up seven hundred and twenty. Seven hundred and twenty, indeed, are the days and nights of the year. Thus he obtains the days and nights of the year. This is the self, commensurate with the year, composed of the eye, the ear, the metres, the mind, speech. He who knows thus this self, commensurate with the year, composed of the eye, the ear, the metres, the mind, speech, wins union, and communion with the year, residence in the same world, and similarity of form. He becomes rich in sons and cattle. He lives all his days. So taught Āruṇikeya.[1] (1.)

Then follows (the teaching of) Kauṇṭharavya.[2] There are three hundred and sixty letters, three hundred and sixty sibilants, three hundred and sixty unions. What we have called letters,[3] they are the days. What we have called sibilants, they are the nights. What we have called unions, they are the unions of days and nights. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. What we have called letters as regards the deities, these are bones as regards the self. What we have called sibilants as regards the deities, these are marrow as regards the self. This indeed is the chief breath, marrow. This is seed. Without breath, indeed, seed cannot be won. If without breath seed were effused,[4] it would decay, it would not be productive. What we have called unions as regards the deities, these are joints[5] as regards the self. Of this triad,[6] bones, marrow, joints, on this side there are five hundred and forty unions, on that side the same; this makes a thousand and eighty. One thousand and eighty Bṛhatī verses the singers[7] produce on this day as the (hymn

[1] Cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 371. For *asya*, cf. vii, 2, note.

[2] Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 2, 3.

[3] Perhaps 'vowels.'

[4] *Sicyeta* seems most probable, as *sicyet* is very irregular. *Sicyāt*, a precative form, is just possible, but not likely.

[5] It would probably be a mistake to press this word for any very definite sense.

[6] *Trayasya* must be supplied in sense, probably also textually; *iti* is here summing up; cf. Böhtlingk, *Dict.*, i, 202; ii, 1; vi, 19; viii, 1 and 9.

[7] *Vārkalino* is, I think, irregular Sandhi for *vā(i) arkalino*, cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, xvii, 380. It is, of course, curious that there is the v.l. *vāṣkalinaḥ*.

of the) day. This is the self, commensurate with the day, composed of the eye, the ear, the metres, the mind, speech. He who knows thus this self, commensurate with the day, composed of the eye, the ear, the metres, the mind, speech, wins union and communion with the days, residence in the same world, and similarity of form. He becomes rich in cows and cattle. He lives all his days. (2.)

'There are four persons,' says Vātsya,[1] 'the person of the body, the person of the metres, the person of the Vedas, the great person.' What we have called the person of the body is the corporeal self. Of it the essence is this incorporeal intelligent self. What we have called the person of the metres is the alphabet. Of it the letter *a* is the essence.[2] What we have called the person of the Vedas is that by which one knows the Vedas, the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, the Sāmaveda. Of it the Brahman(n.) is the essence. Therefore one should take as priest a Brahman priest fullest of Brahman, who can know the unusual[3] in the sacrifice. What we have called the great person is the year. Of it yonder sun is the essence. The incorporeal intelligent self here and yonder sun are the same, so one should know. This is declared in a Ṛc.—[4] (3.)

'The brilliant presence of the gods has risen, the eye of Mitra, Varuṇa, and Agni.
The soul of all that moveth not or moveth, the sun hath filled the air and earth and heaven.'

'Thus do I deem the union duly made,' says Vātsya. Him the Bahvṛcas seek in the Mahad Uktha, him the Adhvaryus in the fire, him the Chandogas in the Mahāvrata, him on earth, him in the atmosphere, him in the heaven, him in the fire, him in the wind, him in the moon, him in the Nakṣatras,

[1] Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 2, 3; *Ind. Stud.*, xvii, 197. The Berlin MS. has *vātsaḥ*.

[2] This is apparently the earliest occurrence of *akṣarasamāmnāya* as 'alphabet.'

[3] So probably *ulbaṇam*, in accordance with the real duties of the Brahman priest; *S.B.E.*, xlii, pp. lix seq. The Sadasya is accorded this function by Paiṅgya, Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxvi, 4.

[4] RV., i, 115, 1.

him in the waters, him in the plants, him in all beings, him in the letters,[1] him they worship as Brahman. This is declared in a Ṛc.—[2] (4.)

'Looking upon the loftier light above the darkness we have come
To Sūrya, god among the gods, the light that is most excellent.'

This is the self, commensurate with the letters, composed of the eye, the ear, the metres, the mind, speech. He who thus this self, commensurate with the letters, composed of the eye, the ear, the metres, the mind, speech, recites to another, his Vedas lose their savour, he has no part in speech, no part in what is studied.[3] This is declared in a Ṛc.—[4] (5.)

'No part in speech hath he who hath abandoned his own dear friend who knows the truth of friendship.
Even if he hears him, still in vain he listens; naught knows he of the path of righteous action.'

In his study there is no part of speech, so he says. Therefore one should not recite (the litany of) that day for another, nor pile up the fire, nor celebrate the Mahāvrata,[5] lest he be torn away from his self.

'This incorporeal self here and yonder sun are one,' we have said. When these two are seen apart,[6] (6.)

The sun appears like the moon, its rays do not shine forth, the sky is leaden like madder, the anus is gaping, 'the self in on the point of death, it will not live long,' so one should

[1] This sentence the Berlin MS. omits, and it is not in the parallel version, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 2, 3.

[2] RV., i, 50, 10.

[3] Read *'nūkte* for the meaningless *nāke* of the MSS.

[4] RV., x, 71, 6.

[5] The Sāman as opposed to the Śastras. Cf. i, 1, and note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 3, 3.

[6] For 6 and 7, cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 2, 4; 5, and notes; *infra*, xi, 3; 4. Some of the predictions, if not all, can be paralleled to-day, even in Europe. In Mbh., vi, 112, 12, we have the moon, *avākśiras*, as a portent, but it is, I think, significant of the early date of the Upaniṣad that the Grahas do not appear here; in the epic they are prominent, Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xxiv, 38 seq. See also Weber, *Omina und Portenta*; Konow, *Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa*; Auśanasādbhutāni, *J.A.O.S.*, xv, 207–20; *Z.D.M.G.*, xxxii, 573 seq.

know. Whatever he considers should be done, he should do. Again, if he sees himself in a mirror or water with a crooked head or without a head, or cannot see himself, he should know that it is so. Again, if his shadow is pierced, or he throws no shadow, he should know that it is so. Again, if the sun appears pierced like the nave of a chariot wheel, he should know that it is so. Again, if the fire appears black like the neck of a peacock, or if amid a large cloud he should see as it were brightness, or when there is no cloud see lightning, or in cloudy weather see it not, he should know that it is so. Again, if closing his eyes he does not see motes, as it were, he should know that it is so. Again, if he shut his ears and listen, and does not then hear a noise as of burning fire or the sound of a chariot, he should know that it is so. Again, if the pupils of the eyes appear inverted or doubly crooked, or cannot be seen, he should know that it is so. 'The unheard, unthought, unknown, unseen, undirected, soundless hearer, thinker, knower, seer, director, sounder, the inner self of all beings, he is my soul,' so should one know. He departing enters into this incorporeal intelligent self, and abandons the other corporeal self. This is the Upaniṣad of speech as a whole. All these, indeed, are Upaniṣads of speech as a whole, but this one they call so especially. (7.)

The mutes[1] are the form of earth, the sibilants of the atmosphere, the vowels of the heaven. The mutes are the form of Agni, the sibilants of Vāyu, and the vowels of Āditya. The mutes are the form of the Ṛgveda, the sibilants of the Yajurveda, the vowels of the Sāmaveda. The mutes are the form of the Rathantara, the sibilants of the Vāmadevya, the vowels of the Bṛhat. The mutes are the form of expiration, the sibilants of inspiration, the vowels of Vyāna.[2] The mutes are the form of expiration, the sibilants of inspiration, the vowels of mind. 'The mutes are the form of expiration, the sibilants of inspiration, the vowels of Udāna,' says

[1] For 8 and 9, cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 2, 5.
[2] For these Prāṇas, cf. Jacob, *Concordance*, s.vv. ; Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, pp. 264 seq. ; *Z.D.M.G.*, lvi, 556.

Punardatta. He, indeed, knows speech as a whole who knows this. (8.)

Again, there is this divine lute. That human lute is an imitation of it. As this has a sounding-board[1] and is tightly strung, so has that a sounding-board and is tightly strung. As this has a head, so that has a head. As this has a spine,[2] so that has a bridge. As this has a belly, so that has a cavity. As this has mouth, nose, and eyes, so that has holes. As this has joints,[3] so that has finger-catches and covers. As this has fingers, so that has strings. As this has a tongue, so that has a sounder. As this has sounds, so that has sounds. As this is covered with a hairy skin, so that is covered with a hairy skin. For with a hairy skin they used of old to cover lutes. This is the divine lute. He who knows thus this divine lute becomes exceedingly famous; his renown fills the earth; men hearken to him when he speaks in the assemblies, (saying), 'Let this be done which he desires.' Where Āryan speech is uttered they know him there. (9.)

Then follows the saying of Tāṇḍavindava. As a lute struck by an unskilled player fulfils not the full purpose of a lute, so speech set in motion by an unskilled speaker fulfils not the full purpose of speech. As a lute struck by a skilled player fulfils the full purpose of a lute, so speech set in motion by a skilled speaker fulfils the full purpose of speech. 'Of this lute the splendour is the union,' says the son of Kātyāyanī, Jātūkarṇya.

Now Kṛtsna Hārita sets forth a Brāhmaṇa.[4] (10.)

Prajāpati having created creatures fell to pieces. He united himself by means of the metres. Because he united himself by means of the metres, there is the union. Of this union the letter *ṇa* is strength, the letter *ṣa* breath, the self the union.

[1] *Śabdavatī* in Aitareya. My rendering is guesswork.

[2] *Vaṃśaḥ* is some bone or other, and this sense occurs later, see Pet. Lex.

[3] Here again there must be a transposition in the text, as there is of 'fingers' and 'strings' in the corresponding sentence to the next in the Aitareya. Cf. Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, lxi, 824, 825.

[4] For 10 and 11, cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 2, 6; for Kṛṣṇa, who appears there for the Kṛtsna of the Śāṅkhāyana, cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, i, 190, n., 391, n.; for *vyasraṃsata*, Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xli, 112, n.; Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, v, 385.

As for this modification[1] (in which gross are) combined with minute (elements), they are nails, hairs, consonants. If he should be in doubt whether to say it with a *ṇa* or without a *ṇa*, let him say it with a *ṇa*. So if he should be in doubt whether to say it with a *ṣa* or without a *ṣa*, let him say it with the *ṣa*. Knowing these two letters *ṇa* and *ṣa* one should study the Ṛc verses according to the Saṃhitā text. Let him know that it is lifegiving. Again, speech is the Itihāsapurāṇa,[2] and whatever else there is of holy work; this should one study; let him know this also (to be lifegiving). 'In that we study the Ṛc verses according to the Saṃhitā and speak forth the recitation of Māṇḍūkeya, so we secure the letters *ṇa* and *ṣa*,' says Hrasva Māṇḍūkeya. Again, 'In that we study the Ṛc verses according to the Saṃhitā and learn the recitation, so we secure the letters *ṇa* and *ṣa*,' says Sthavira Śākalya. Knowing that the Kāvaṣeyas say, 'For what purpose shall we sacrifice, for what purpose shall we study? For in speech we offer breath, in breath speech. The source is also the scene of disappearance.' 'These Saṃhitās one should not proclaim to one who is not a pupil, who is not a pupil for a year, who is not a student, who is not a knower of the Vedas, who is not to be a teacher,' so say the teachers.[3] (11.)

Adhyāya IX.

Om.

We crave of Savitṛ the god this treasure much to be enjoyed.
The best, all-yielding, conquering gift of Bhaga gladly we would win.[4]
May we attain the excellent glory of Savitṛ the god:
So may he stimulate our prayers.[5]

Mind undeceived, living eye, sun best of lights. Consecration

[1] Cf. vii, 21, and Aitareya, ii, 6. *Vyañjanāni* should perhaps be taken of the body.

[2] A definite book, Geldner, *Ved. Stud.*, i, 290. Hardly so, cf. Oertel, *Am. Journ. Phil.*, xx, 447; Jackson's attempt (*J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 530) to find Mahābhārata and Harivaṃśa is hardly lucky.

[3] Possibly a plural *majestatis*, and 'teacher' may be intended.

[4] RV., v, 82, 1.

[5] RV., iii, 62, 10.

harm me not.[1] He[2] who knows the highest and best becomes highest and best among his own (people). Breath indeed is the highest and best. He who knows the most excellent becomes the most excellent among his own (people). Speech indeed is the most excellent. He who knows the support finds support both in this world and in that. The eye indeed is support. He who knows obtainment, his desires are obtained together for him. The ear indeed is obtainment. He who knows the resort becomes the resort of his own (people). Mind indeed is the resort. These deities approached Prajāpati and said, 'Who indeed is the best of us?' Prajāpati said, 'He is the best on whose departure the body considers itself worst as it were.' (2.)

Speech departed. They were like dumb men, speechless, breathing with breath, seeing with the eye, hearing with the ear, thinking with the mind. (3.)

Sight departed. They were like blind men, sightless, breathing with breath, speaking with speech, hearing with the ear, thinking with the mind. (4.)

Hearing departed. They were like deaf men, devoid of hearing, breathing with breath, speaking with speech, seeing with the eye, thinking with the mind. (5.)

Mind departed. They were like infants, without mind, breathing with breath, speaking with speech, seeing with the eye, hearing with the ear. (6.)

Breath departed. Then just as a fine steed from the Indus strains the pin of his hobbles,[3] so he strained the breaths. They assembled and said, 'Lord, depart not.' Breath said, 'What will be my food?' 'All there is up to dogs, up to birds.' 'What will be my clothing?' 'The waters,' they replied. Therefore a man about to eat purifies himself before

[1] See vii, 1.

[2] Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, v, 1; 2; Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, vi, 2 (= K. 3); *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 373, 374; above, ii, 14; iii, 3. In the close parallels, Chāndogya, v, 1, and Bṛhadāraṇyaka, vi, 2, the *evam iti* is motived by its being a reply to a question by breath. Here it is a survival.

[3] See Pischel, *Ved. Stud.*, i, 234, 235, not 'foot ropes' as usually rendered in the parallel passages. The *āśvabhyaḥ* is uncertain; I follow Böhtlingk's version. Max Müller (*S.B.E.*, xv, 204, n. 1) suggests every kind of food, such as is eaten by dogs, etc., and Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 135, n. 1, takes that as the sense in Chāndogya, v, 2, 1.

and after with water. He is eager to take his clothing, for he is not naked. This Satyakāma Jābāla declared to Gośruta Vaiyāghrapadya and said, 'If one declared this to a dry stump, there would arise from it branches, there would spring up blossoms.' 'Spring forth, tree, with a hundred blossoms. Harm not the sky, harm not the atmosphere,' says Yājñavalkya.[1] (7.)

Now if one desires to obtain something important, after consecrating himself for three nights, on the night of new moon, having mixed with curds and honey a mess of all sorts of herbs, having built up the fire, having swept (the place of sacrifice), having scattered (grass) about, having sprinkled water, bending the right knee, he places the mess in a vessel to the north of the fire, sacrifices, and pours into the mess the remainder of the oblation. '*Svāhā* to the highest and best,' (with these words) having sacrificed in the fire, he should pour the rest into the mess. '*Svāhā* to the most excellent,' (with these words) having sacrificed in the fire, he should pour the rest into the mess. '*Svāhā* to support,' (with these words) having sacrificed in the fire, he should pour the rest into the mess. '*Svāhā* to obtainment,' (with these words) having sacrificed in the fire, he should pour the rest into the mess. '*Svāhā* to resort,' (with these words) having sacrificed in the fire, he should pour the rest into the mess.' Having eaten, (repeating) by quarter-verses 'We crave of Savitṛ,' he sips, (repeating) by quarter-verses 'The excellent (glory) of Savitṛ,' the fourth (sip) being accompanied by the Vyāhṛtis.[2] Then he washes the vessel and goes to rest on a skin or on the bare ground. If he sees a woman,[3] he should know that his rite is successful. (8.)

Adhyāya X.

Then follows the internal Agnihotra[4] relating to the self. So they describe it. These deities, indeed, are established in

[1] Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, v, 43; cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 374.

[2] Because RV., iii, 62, 10, has only three Pādas.

[3] i.e. he sleeps and dreams. The efficacy of sleeping on earth for mantic purposes is recognised all over the world. For the ritual, cf. iv, 3; xii, 8.

[4] See *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 374, 375.

man; fire in speech, wind in breath, sun in the eye, moon in the mind, the quarters in the ear, the waters in the seed. In all of these is offering made by him who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. He eats, he drinks, he delights, he causes delight. (1.)

He delighted delights speech, speech delighted delights fire, fire delighted delights earth, earth delighted whatever is covered by earth. Present, future, past, all that he delights, who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. He eats, he drinks, he delights, he causes delight. (2.)

He delighted delights breath, breath delighted delights wind, wind delighted delights ether, ether delighted all that is covered by ether. Present, future, past, all that he delights, who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. He eats, he drinks, he delights, he causes delight. (3.)

He delighted delights the eye, the eye delighted delights the sun, the sun delighted delights the sky, the sky delighted whatever is covered by the sky. Present, future, past, all that he delights, who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. He eats, he drinks, he delights, he causes delight. (4.)

He delighted delights the mind, the mind delighted delights the moon, the moon delighted delights the Nakṣatras, the Nakṣatras delighted delight the months, the months delighted delight the half-months, the half-months delighted delight the days and nights, the days and nights delighted delight the seasons, the seasons delighted delight the year, the year delighted whatever is covered by the year. Present, future, past, all that he delights, who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. He eats, he drinks, he delights, he causes delight. (5.)

He delighted delights the ear, the ear delighted delights the quarters, the quarters delighted delight the intermediate quarters, the intermediate quarters what is covered by the intermediate quarters. Present, future, past, all that he delights, who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. He eats, he drinks, he delights, he causes delight. (6.)

He delighted delights seed, seed delighted delights the waters, the waters delighted delight the rivers, the rivers delighted delight the ocean, the ocean delighted whatever is covered by the ocean. Present, future, past, all that he delights, who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. He eats, he drinks, he delights, he causes delight. (7.)

He delighted is the tenfold, Virāj-like, Agnihotra. His expiration is the Āhavanīya (fire), his inspiration the Gārhapatya, his Vyāna the Anvāhāryapacana, his mind the smoke, his anger the flame, his teeth the coals, his faith the milk, his speech the brand, his truth the oblation, his intelligent self the essence. That Virāj-like, tenfold, Agnihotra is offered. Him it sends to the world of heaven, which is mounted by these two ascents,[1] who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink. Now if one, knowing not this Agnihotra, sacrifices, it is with him as though he pushed aside the coals and made oblation in the ashes. (8.)

Adhyāya XI.

Prajāpati[2] elevated this person. In him he made these deities to dwell, in his speech fire, in his expiration wind, in his inspiration the lightning, in his Udāna Parjanya, in his eye the sun, in his mind the moon, in his ear the quarters, in his body the earth, in his seed the waters, in his strength Indra, in his anger Īśāna, in his head the ether, in his self Brahman(n.). As a great jar of ambrosia stands swelling, so he stood. Then these deities considered, 'What shall this person do with us, or what we with him? Come, let us depart from the body.' They departed. Then this body was, as it were empty, and perforated on all sides.[3] Prajāpati reflected,

[1] i.e. the real and the *āntara* Agnihotras, but the real one, even if performed without knowledge, is ineffective. The passage looks like a fragment of a verse.

[2] For this Adhyāya, cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 375. *Udañcat* is read by Cowell's MS. B; for the confusion of *ud* and *ad*, cf. v, 5.

[3] This seems the most probable sense (*pari-suṣira*) and supports the emendation to *randhrāya na kṣamam* (for *na makṣam* of the MSS.) which I have made in the next sentence. Otherwise we might read *pariśuṣiram*, and take it as 'dried up,' from *śvas* with *ira*, cf. Lindner, *Altind. Nominalbildung*, pp. 100 sq.; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 130.

'The body is not capable of standing these gaps. Come, I will vex them with hunger and thirst.' Them he vexed; they, being vexed and finding no joy, again entered this person. (1.)

(Saying), 'Speech is mine,' fire entered. (Saying), 'Expiration is mine,' wind entered. (Saying), 'Inspiration is mine,' lightning entered. (Saying), 'The Udāna is mine,' Parjanya entered. (Saying), 'The eye is mine,' the sun entered. (Saying), 'The mind is mine,' the moon entered. (Saying), 'The ear is ours,' the quarters entered. (Saying), 'The body is mine,' the earth entered. (Saying), 'The seed is ours,' the waters entered. (Saying), 'The strength is mine,' Indra entered. (Saying), 'Anger is mine,' Īśāna entered. (Saying), 'The head is mine,' the ether entered. (Saying), 'The self is mine,' Brahman entered. As a great green tree stands with its roots moistened, so he stood. (2.)

Now a man when he is to die before the year's end, sees visions of the year.[1] His shadow is crooked, or is not seen at all. He may see either light, as it were, in a great cloud or lightning without a cloud, or not see lightning in a cloud. Closing his eyes he does not see motes, as it were. Or closing his ears he does not hear a noise, as it were. He has no joy in this world; his mind pleases him not.[2] These are the waking visions. (3.)

Then follow the dream visions. He sees a black man with black teeth. He kills him, a boar kills him, a monkey kills him. He devours stalks; having devoured them he spits them forth. He carries a single lotus. Wearing a wreath of spikenard, he drives towards the south a cow with its calf. If he sees any of the following things, a yellow-looking or black woman, with loosened hair, or shaved, anointing with sesamum oil, a garment dyed with safflower, singing, a buffalo carriage, going to the south, etc., having looked at them he fasts, cooks milk in a pot, using the milk of a cow which

[1] Cf. viii, 7.

[2] Or 'it pleases not him, his mind,' an acc. of whole and part, rare in Vedic and Sanskrit, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, p. 8, whose citation of Atharva Veda, v, 8, 9, is not in point, as *marmāṇi* is a false reading for *marmaṇi*.

has a calf like itself, but on no account of a black[1] cow, piles up the fire, sweeps out (the place of sacrifice), scatters grass, sprinkles water around, and, bending the right knee, offers oblations of ghee by means of a ladle. (4.)

'In my speech rests fire, *svāhā*. In my expiration rests wind, *svāhā*. In my inspiration rests the lightning, *svāhā*. In my Udāna rests Parjanya, *svāhā*. In my eye rests the sun, *svāhā*. In my mind rests the moon, *svāhā*. In my ear rest the quarters, *svāhā*. In my body rests the earth, *svāhā*. In my seed rest the waters, *svāhā*. In my strength rests Indra, *svāhā*. In my anger rests Īśāna, *svāhā*. In my head rests the ether, *svāhā*. In my self rests Brahman(n.), *svāhā*,' (he repeats), and then pouring the remainder of the ghee into the pot of milk he offers the pot of milk, ladling it out.[2] (5.)

'In my speech rests fire, speech in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my expiration rests wind, expiration in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my inspiration rests the lightning, inspiration in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my Udāna rests Parjanya, Udāna in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my eye rests the sun, the eye in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my mind rests the moon, mind in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my ear rest the quarters, the ear in the heart, the heart in the self.

[1] Here the taboo is sympathetic negative magic, contrast Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa, ii, 8, 3. Cf. Marrett, *Anthropological Essays presented to Tylor*, pp. 219–34.

[2] Possibly *upaghātam* is here a noun.

That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my body rests the earth, the body in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my seed rest the waters, seed in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my strength rests Indra, strength in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my anger rests Īśāna, anger in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my head rests the ether, the head in the heart, the heart in the self. That is the truth of the deities. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*. In my self rests Brahman(n.), the self in the heart, *svāhā*,' (he repeats), and sacrifices by consuming the remains of the pot of milk.[1] (6.)

Stone is of Jagatī, iron [2] of Triṣṭubh, copper of Uṣṇih, lead of Kakubh, silver of Svarāj, gold of Gāyatrī, food of Virāj, enjoyment of Anuṣṭubh, the firmament of Samrāj, Bṛhaspati of Bṛhatī, Brahman(n.) of Paṅkti, Prajāpati of Atichandas, the Sāvitrī [3] of the metre of all the Vedas. (7.)

'May I be established firm as a stone [4] by the Jagatī metre. Man is the jewel, breath the thread, food the knot, that knot I tie, desiring food, a holy power [5] against death. May I obtain full length of days, long lived. I shall not die against my will. May I be rich in food, an eater of food, *svāhā*.

[1] i.e. he drinks it.

[2] For the meaning of *ayas*, cf. Zimmer, *Altind. Leben*, pp. 51 seq.; Schraeder, *Prehist. Antiq.*, pp. 187 seq.

[3] The reference is very curious, but presumably alludes to the Gāyatrī.

[4] For the use of the stone, cf. its use in the marriage ritual, and Westermarck, *Anthropological Essays*, pp. 374 seq.; Frazer, ibid., pp. 132–4; Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, p. 231.

[5] This seems the best rendering of *mṛtyave brāhmaṇam*. The metaphor is from an amulet, which consists of a jewel on a string, cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, xvii, 202; xviii, 182; Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, p. cxxxii.

May I be established firm as iron by the Triṣṭubh metre. Man is the jewel,[1] etc. May I be established firm as copper by the Uṣṇih metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as lead by the Kakubh metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as silver by the Svarāj metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as gold by the Gāyatrī metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as food by the Virāj metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as enjoyment by the Anuṣṭubh metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as the firmament by the Samrāj[2] metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as Bṛhaspati by the Bṛhatī metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as Brahman(n.) by the Paṅkti metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as Prajāpati by the Atichandas metre. Man is the jewel, etc. May I be established firm as the Sāvitrī by the metre of all the Vedas. Man is the jewel,' etc. (he repeats). Either to a dear wife, or a dear pupil, or to whomsoever else he favours, he should give the remains of the oblation.[3] He indeed lives a hundred years, who ever and again performs this (rite). (8.)

Adhyāya XII.

Om. May that splendour of the elephant, of great power, manifest itself which was born from Aditi's body. That all those have given to me, the Ādityas in unison with Aditi.[4] (1.)

The great splendour that is deposited in thee, Jātavedas, with that splendour do thou make me resplendent.[5] (2.)

[1] The text in the Berlin MS. repeats in full, but as sufficient exemplification of repetition is given in xi, 6, I have followed the Bodleian in curtailing.

[2] In imitation of the Svarāj, no doubt.

[3] The gods enter the oblation and hence its sacredness; cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 938 seq.; Westermarck, *Anthropological Essays*, p. 374; *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, i, 445 seq.; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, iii, 11.

[4] Cf. Atharva Veda, iii, 22, 1; Roth, *Ind. Stud.*, xiv, 392; Weber, ibid., xvii, 282 seq.

[5] This corresponds closely with the Paippalāda version of Atharva Veda, iii, 22, 2 (= parts of 3 and 4 of the vulgate).

The splendour that is in man, that is deposited in elephants, the splendour in gold and kine, in me be that splendour of the elephant.[1] (3.)

The glory that there is in golden dice,[2] in cows and horses, in the Surā being purified, in me be that splendour of the elephant. (4.)

In me be radiance, in me greatness, in me the glory of the sacrifice, in me may Prajāpati make that fast as the heaven in the sky.[3] (5. 1.)

May the Aśvins anoint me with the honey of bees, with milk, that a honey-sweet voice I may utter among the folk.[4] (6.)

Snatched out of ghee, rich in honey and milk, winning wealth, bearing and supporting, destroying our foes and putting them down, mount upon me for great good fortune.[5] (7.)

None other than thou, Prajāpati, doth encircle all these beings. That for which we long in sacrificing to thee, be that ours. May we be lords of riches.[6] (8.)

May this ancient (amulet) crush my foes, even as Indra Vṛtra, enduring in the battles. As Agni a forest, spread widely, so in the winds the sharp-toothed one rubs me.[7] (9.)

This ancient one who accords with us in sooth, as Indra Vṛtra, has rent the burghs asunder. With this, Indra,

[1] Cf. Atharva Veda, vi, 69, 1 ; xiv, 1, 35, for vv. 3 and 4.

[2] This is not in the Atharva, but there is no reason to suspect it. We must therefore accept Lüders' doctrine (*Das Würfelspiel im alten Indien*, p. 21) that the mention of gold dice need not refer to the late *pāśaka* game. Even in the Vibhīdaka game a rich man might ostentatiously have golden dice, and this notice shows they were actually used, not merely a ritual aberration ; *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 827.

[3] Cf. Atharva Veda, vi, 69, 3. We must pronounce *divaṃ va* or *diveva* for the metre, almost certainly the latter, see Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, lxi, 830–2.

[4] I read, for *samahān*, *samaṅktāṃ*, *ṅkt* being misread. *Payas* is = *payasā* on Roth's principle, cf. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, i, p. xvii ; Pischel, *Ved. Stud.*, ii, 331. See Atharva Veda, vi, 69, 2 ; ix, 1, 19, and for *madhu* and *payas* the next verse, and *S.B.E.*, xlii, 587 ; RV., ix, 11, 2.

[5] Cf. Atharva Veda, v, 28, 14 ; xix, 33, 2 ; Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p. 118. The last parallel is against reading (*a*)*dhārayiṣṇuḥ*.

[6] RV., x, 121, 10.

[7] I take *sano* as 'ancient.' The 'sharp-toothed' is the amulet which in the wind strikes against the speaker's body, as Agni on the trees of the forest. For the theory of wind and forest fires, see Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xx, 217 ; xxiv, 390, 391 ; Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, ii, 65, n. 1. The rendering and reading of the verses which occur only here are very uncertain.

smiting aside the foes, bring us the wealth of the hostile ones.[1] (10. 2.)

Conquer the foes, conquer, hero, the enemy. Slaying Vṛtra, cleave him with thine axe. Like the flood pieces of wood, let him smite away our foes, and lay low our enemies as an axe the woods.[2] (11.)

Cleave along from the middle, cleave forward from above, cleave from behind, cleave, O hero; the foes smitten by thee, O bountiful one, O hero, let the Maruts follow thee as thou destroyest. (12.)

Thee swelling with Rudra's darts, deeming thee Indra, let the Maruts gladly choose. Let the vultures and herons seize on them (the foes). May the tusker be joyous in the increase.[3] (13.)

O bountiful one, may thy blows fall on all sides on the enemy smitten by the spell. May they own no friend, no support. Mutually hindering they go to death.[4] (14.)

O glorious Agni, bring us to glory. Bring hither Indra's recompense. May he be the head, the supreme, the splendid, of his kinsmen may he have the highest praise.[5] (15. 3.)

With auspicious glances they have sat down. The Ṛṣis who know heaven have come to the consecration. Then were heroism, strength, and might born. May this the gods to him make obedient.[6] (16.)

Creator, disposer, highest seer, Prajāpati, the supreme, the splendid. The Stomas, the metres, the Nivids mine they call. To him may they make the kingdom obedient.[7] (17.)

[1] The reading is doubtful, but *Indra* must be supplied, I think, and *puro* (apparently in the Berlin MS.) is rather better, though *duro* is quite possible; and then *kīlaḥ* might be read.

[2] *Jahyāt*, which must be read, has a somewhat unusual sense here.

[3] i.e. eat the bodies. This is fair sense without emendation. The meaning of *kaṅka* is doubtful, cf. *kaṅkaparvan*, Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 558; Zimmer, *Altind. Leben*, p. 92.

[4] I read *mā jñātāram īśata mā pratiṣṭhāṃ mitho vighnānā upayānti*; cf. Atharva Veda, vi, 32, 3; viii, 8, 21; Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 475; Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, iii, 10, 11.

[5] For vv. 15–18, cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, v, 7, 4, 3–5, with a good many variants. The verses here are absurdly out of place.

[6] Cf. Atharva Veda, xix, 41, 1; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, iii, 11, 9. I read *bhadraṃ paśyanta* and *kṣatram*. *Tato* is probably an error for *tapo*.

[7] The reading appears to be *stomāṃś*, perhaps a correction for the

Approach hither, pay him honour. Let Agni be our ruler and our king. Be ye in accordance with his will. On him hereafter do ye all depend.[1] (18.)

Thou art born, Alarda by name, before the sun, before the dawn. I know thee as destroyer of my enemies, and overthrower of their supports.[2] (19.)

He will not be cut off in the midst (of life),[3] he will overcome his foe, he will be skilled in speech, he will be strong against battles, his foe they call likely to perish, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (20. 4.)

He eats not accursed food,[4] he commits no sin, the heavenly Varuṇa terrifies him not, nor slays him, wrath overcomes him not in anger, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (21.)

Jātavedas injures not his skin. He eats not flesh[5] nor harms these (creatures). After a hundred (years of life), reaching old age, in this world, he departs, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (22.)

No offspring of his is harmed in birth, no robber, no evil deed is there, nothing else amiss happens in his families, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (23.)

In his house there are no reviling[6] nor scolding women, nor those who quarrel. Misfortune comes not to him, nor does she fix her abode in him, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (24.)

Him neither Rakṣas nor Piśāca injures, nor Jambhaka,[7] nor

stomās of the Saṃhitā (where *āhuḥ* is parenthetical, cf. note on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ii, 3, 8).

[1] This verse is altered to make Agni subject.

[2] *Alarda* is a new word (the nearest word in appearance is *alarka*, Böhtlingk, *Dict.*, i, 294; Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 536, n. 2), but there is no special reason to doubt the reading.

[3] For the loc., cf. Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, xv, 21, 8; p. 5, n. 2.

[4] *Śaptam* for the *suptam* of the MSS., which hardly makes sense. Spells against curses are not rare in the Atharvan, cf. Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 285, 556.

[5] Cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, xvii, 280, 314; Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, 119, 120.

[6] *Apavādā* is probably an adjective like *pravādakā*, which I read for *pravātakā*, which, however, might perhaps be rendered 'unsteady.' The reading *saṃpatantyo* seems certain, and the last part of the line must be construed with the next line.

[7] Some sort of demon, cf. Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, xxx, 16; Böhtlingk's *Dict.*, s.v.; and cf. *jambha*, Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 283.

Asura, nor Yakṣa. In his house there is no lying-in woman,[1] who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (25. 5.)

Him neither tiger, nor wolf, nor panther, nor beast of prey whatsoever hurts. No angry elephant meets he to scare him, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (26.)

No serpent, nor viper, nor scorpion, nor striped one,[2] nor black one injures him, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (27.)

He sins not so that Varuṇa harms him; no crocodile, nor shark, nor porpoise injures him; on all sides it makes peace for him, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (28.)

They say his foe is likely to perish, like a flower fallen[3] from its stalk. Like the flood pieces of wood, he shall overcome his foes, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva. (29.)

This amulet, the reverter,[4] of the Jamba,[5] is tied on for the sake of life. By it Indra slew Vṛtra, and by the help of the wise Ṛṣi. (30. 6.)

Overcome, Indra, our foes, overcome our enemies, overcome the warriors; like an elephant (?) with its fore-feet, outmatch the warriors. (31.)

Here has come the amulet of Bilva, the strong subduer of foes. The Ṛṣis, all heroic, behold it that they may overcome their foes in the battle. (32.)

Ambrosia is the thread in this amulet. May the Aśvins fasten (the thread). Thou art of the Bilva, of a thousand powers. May I that bear thee never be injured. (33.)

Snatched out[6] of ghee, rich in honey and milk, winning

[1] For the tabu of such women, cf. Frazer, *Anthropological Essays*, pp. 151 seq.; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, ii, 5, 1, 5.

[2] *Tiraścīnarājī* should, I think, be read, cf. *tiraścirājī* in Atharva Veda, iii, 27, 2; Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 488; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, xvii, 297; *tiraścīnarājī* in Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, ii, 13, 21. It would be tempting to render *tiraści na rājā* as 'nor beast nor king' (for the king's exactions, cf. Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, 89 seq.), but the form *tiraści* would be difficult, and the joke beyond the writer. For *kṛṣṇa*, cf. Atharva Veda, xi, 2, 2; vii, 56, 2; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, iii, 14, 17.

[3] An early instance of *saha* with a verb of separation; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 95. For *śāpa*, cf. Geldner, *Ved. Stud.*, iii, 184.

[4] Cf. Atharva Veda, iv, 40; *punaḥsarā*, iv, 17, 2; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, xiii, 164; xviii, 74, 75, 182; Ludwig, *Ṛgveda*, iii, 345; Zimmer, *Altind. Leben*, p. 263; Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, p. cxxxiii; *S.B.E.*, xlii, 394, 576.

[5] Presumably a plant, cf. Böhtlingk's *Dict.*, s.v. *jambāla*.

[6] v. 34 = v. 7; v. 35 = v. 8.

wealth, bearing and supporting, destroying our foes and putting them down, mount upon me for great good fortune. (34.)

None other than thou (Prajāpati) doth encircle all these beings. That for which we long in sacrificing to thee, be that ours. May we be lords of riches. (35.)

Then come five verses,[1] (beginning), 'Thou art the great ruler here.' (7.)

Then follows the ritual of the amulet. A man who desires prosperity should fast on flowers for three nights, then taking a piece from a living[2] elephant's tusk, he should pile up the fire, sweep out (the place of sacrifice), scatter grass, sprinkle water around, and bending his right knee, place the amulet in a vessel to the north of the fire, sacrifice, and pour upon the amulet the remnant from the oblation, to the accompaniment of the eight verses (vv. 1–8), beginning 'Splendour of the elephant,' verse by verse. Then for seven nights, or three nights, or one he should leave it to stand in honey and ghee and then put it on, with the verse (v. 7) 'Snatched out of ghee.' Then next with six (vv. 9–14) he should put on, having left it to stand for three nights or one in (a mess of) meat and boiled rice, an amulet of the point of the heart-spit or the point of the goad or the point of the mortar or of the core[3] of the *Acacia catechu*. Then next with four verses (vv. 15–18) he should put on an amulet of the point of a bull's horn, having left it to stand for three nights or one in (a mess of) ghee and boiled rice. Then next with one verse (v. 19) he should put on an amulet of the castor-oil plant, having left it to stand for three nights or one in (a mess of) sesamum and boiled rice. Then next with sixteen verses (vv. 20–35) he should put on an amulet of Bilva, having left it to stand for seven nights or three or one in honey and ghee, fastening it with the verse (v. 34) 'Snatched out of ghee.' Then with the next five

[1] RV., x, 152, 1; also cited in ii, 15.
[2] Cf. Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 287, n. 1.
[3] *Khadirasāramaṇim*, where *sāra* cannot mean resin (*rasa*). The Khadira is chosen as a specially hard wood, cf. Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 609, 610. For the heart-spit, cf. ibid., 506. For the whole rite, cf. Caland, *Altind. Zauberritual*, p. 11, n. 8.

(vv. 36–40) verses he should bind on a splinter[1] of the *Ficus infectoria* which he has left to stand for three nights or one in a (mess of) beans and boiled rice. If possible he should first sacrifice in the shadow of an elephant or on a tiger's skin or[2] sitting. (8.)

Adhyāya XIII.

Then[3] when his body has been made prepared for indifference to desire, he should be bent on the Brahman offering. So he drives repeated death away. 'The self is to be seen, to be heard, to be thought, to be meditated on,'[4] 'Him they seek to know by repeating the Vedas, by studentship, by asceticism, by faith, by sacrifice, by fasting,'[5] says Māṇḍūkeya. 'Therefore, he who knows this, calm, restrained, still, enduring, becoming full of faith, should see the self in the self,'[6] says Māṇḍavya. '"The person among the breath composed of knowledge is incomprehensible, to be distinguished as 'No, no.'[7] This self is the warrior-class, this the priesthood, this the gods, this the Vedas, this the worlds, this all beings, this is all.[8] This is 'That art thou.' The self is to be recognised in 'I am Brahman.' This Brahman, without predecessor, without superior, without other, immediate, without an exterior, is this self, Brahman(n.), all-experiencing," such is the teaching,' says Yājñavalkya.[9] 'That one should not proclaim to one who is not a son or a pupil.' 'Were a man to offer this earth surrounded by water and filled with wealth, yet is this more

[1] I read *mahāvarohasya* (°*varāhasya* MSS.), a word hitherto only known from lexica, and *udoha* I regard as a derivative of *ūh*, cf. *udūha* in Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii, 8, 4, 3 (besom ?). Splinters are often used in such rites, Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, 291, etc.

[2] The *vāpi* distinctly makes this a third alternative, perhaps wrongly.

[3] Cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 382. For *punarmṛtyu*, see Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 93 seq.

[4] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, iv, 5, 6 (= ii, 4, 5).

[5] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 4, 25.

[6] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 4, 28.

[7] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 4, 27 (with *agṛhyaḥ*); Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads*, p. 149, for Hillebrandt's theory of *na* as affirmative (cf. *Vedische Mythologie*, ii, 236, n. 2); *na gṛhyaḥ* is possible here.

[8] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 5, 7.

[9] Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 5, 19.

than that, more than that,' is the teaching.[1] This Upaniṣad he should declare to be the head of the Veda [2] in very truth. This is declared in a Ṛc:—

Adhyāya XIV.

'Head of the Ṛc verses, highest member of the Yajus verses, pinnacle of the Sāmans, the supreme tonsure of the Atharvans, he who studies not the Veda, him they call ignorant. Cleaving his head, he makes himself a corpse.[3] (1.)

'He is but a pillar indeed who bears a burden, who repeats the Veda without knowing the meaning. Who knows the meaning alone wins prosperity. He goes to heaven, shaking off sin through knowledge.'[4] (2.)

Adhyāya XV.

Om. Then follows the line of teachers.[5] Honour to Brahman, honour to the teachers!

We have learnt it from Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana, Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana from Kahola Kauṣītaki, Kahola Kauṣītaki from Uddālaka Āruṇi, Uddālaka Āruṇi from Priyavrata Saumāpi,

[1] Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, vii, 11, 6.

[2] Cf. the title, Atharvaśiras, of an early Atharvan Upaniṣad, Bloomfield, *S.B.E.*, xlii, p xlvii.

[3] Cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 383, 384. For *muṇḍamuṇḍa*, apparently an intensive Āmredita, cf. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, ii, 1, 147, 148; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 155. Cf. the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, pp. 544, 545, which may possibly have been known to the writer of this late verse just as the Atharvaśiras may have been known.

[4] Cf. Yāska, Nirukta, i, 18, and Roth, *Erläuterungen*, p. 19; Burnell, *Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, p. 38; *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, pp. 381, 382. As Colonel Jacob has reminded me, the second verse in Yāska occurs slightly altered in the introduction to the Mahābhāṣya.

[5] The shortness of the Vaṃśa is in striking contrast to the lists of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣads, and shows the impossibility of using such lists for chronology. For Kahola, see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, iii, 5, 1 (Kahoda in Mādhyandina); for Uddālaka, Oldenberg, *Buddha*, E. T., p. 396; for Priyavrata Somāpi (or Saumāpi), Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii, 34; for Bṛhaddiva, Ṛṣi of RV., x, 120, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iv, 14; for Viśvamanas and Vyaśva, Ludwig, *Ṛgveda*, iii, 106; Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, xlii, 217; for Sākamaśva, Ārṣeya Brāhmaṇa, i, 7; for Viśvāmitra, Ludwig, iii, 121.

Priyavrata Saumāpi[1] from Somapa, Somapa from Soma[2] Prātiveśya, Soma Prātiveśya from Prativeśya, Prativeśya from Bṛhaddiva, Bṛhaddiva from Sumnayu, Sumnayu from Uddālaka, Uddālaka from Viśvamanas, Viśvamanas from Vyaśva, Vyaśva from Sākamaśva Devarāta, Devarāta from Viśvāmitra, Viśvāmitra from Indra, Indra from Prajāpati, Prajāpati from Brahman, Brahman(n.) is self-existent. Honour to Brahman, honour to Brahman!

[1] The Berlin MS. reads Somāpi, as does a Benares MS. dated *saṃvat* 1663, of the existence of which I have just learned through the kindness of Dr. F. Otto Schrader, Director of the Adyar Library, Madras, who writes (July 24, 1908): "Adhyāyas i-v are = Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad (the Mahāvrata section being absent), then follows Saṃhitopaniṣad as Adhyāya viii, the simplified Chāndogya as Adhyāya ix, etc. At xii the counting of the Adhyāyas ceases . . . There seems to be some connection with the Bodleian MS." From Somapa, Saumapi would be regular (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 466).

[2] The Berlin and Benares MSS. have Soma, the Bodleian Sauma.

APPENDIX.

The Mahāvrata.

In the accepted system of the Vedic sacrifices the Mahāvrata forms the second last day of the Gavāmayana Sattra, which lasts a year and is a symbol of the year. There can, however, be no doubt that this position of the day is rather artificial, and that the Mahāvrata marks the commencement of the year. The priestly ingenuity, which has transferred the Mahāvrata to the second last day of the year, has created a duplicate in the Caturviṃśa, the second day of the Gavāmayana, but it is easy to see through so obvious a manipulation.

Much more obscure is the relation of the Mahāvrata and the Viṣuvant day, which in the accepted system is reckoned as the middle of the Gavāmayana. Professor Hillebrandt[1] has expressed the view that the Viṣuvant and the Mahāvrata have been changed in place by the priests, and that originally the Mahāvrata fell on the Summer solstice, and the Viṣuvant began the year at the Winter solstice. The view is extremely plausible and supported by strong arguments, so that it deserves full and careful consideration.

Now it is quite certain that the accepted ritualistic view places the Mahāvrata at the Winter solstice. The Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa,[2] for example, explicitly says that it occurs at the moment when the sun, after going south for six months, stops, as it is about to turn for the north. It has, indeed, been suggested that the six monthly periods refer to the equinoxes, but I consider that Dr. Thibaut[3] has once and for all disposed of this argument, which in any case would not affect Professor Hillebrandt's position. It remains, therefore, to seek for

[1] See Hillebrandt, *Rom. Forsch.*, v, 299 seq.; *Vedische Opfer und Zauber*, pp. 157, 158; *Vedische Mythologie*, iii, 216. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 444, rejects the theory of change of date, but gives no reasons.

[2] xix, 3.

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, xxiv, 85 seq.

evidence showing that another dating of the Mahāvrata was possible.

A sign of this has been seen by Professor Hillebrandt in the statement in the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa[1] that the Mahāvrata should be placed in the middle of the year. But the statement is not accepted by the Brāhmaṇa as correct, and as it is characteristic of the Brāhmaṇa style to make every sort of vague suggestion before arriving at the facts, it is not even possible to say that any Brahminical school, much less the people, ever reckoned the Mahāvrata at the Summer solstice.

More important is a second argument derived from the assignment of Sāmans to the Mahāvrata in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra.[2] That Sūtra ascribes to that day the Bṛhat, Mahādivākīrtya, and Rathantara Sāmans, and Professor Hillebrandt shows that the Bṛhat is made up of hymns and verses addressed for the most part, though not in all cases, to Indra, the Mahādivākīrtya of hymns and verses addressed to Sūrya. Now both the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā[3] and the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa[4] connect the Viṣuvant with the Divākīrtya or Mahādivākīrtya Sāman, and it is therefore suggested that the presence of this Sāman in the Mahāvrata is merely the result of contamination of the rites, and that originally to the Mahāvrata and the Viṣuvant respectively belonged the Bṛhat and the Mahādivākīrtya Sāmans, connected the one with Indra, the other with Sūrya. Now prayers to Sūrya are most naturally connected with the efforts required at the Winter solstice to rescue the sun from destruction and death, while Indra's season is the breaking of the monsoon about the Summer solstice, when he overcomes Vṛtra, the demon of drought, and waxes great.[5] A further support for this argument is derived from the third of the Sāmans assigned to the Mahāvrata by Śāṅkhāyana, the Rathantara. That Sāman was, it is held, originally, in place of the Mahādivākīrtya, the Sāman of the Viṣuvant, and as it is evidently connected with the sun—its very name 'wheel-impelling' reminding us of the wheels used in Schleswig at

1 iv, 10, 3; cf. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, i, 2, 6.
2 xi, 13, 21 seq.
3 iv, 8, 10.
4 i, 2, 3, 1.
5 Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i, 1, 1, with my note.

the Winter solstice as sun-spells—we have another argument for the connection of the Viṣuvant with the Winter sun and the Mahāvrata with the Summer solstice.

The argument clearly rests on too many hypotheses to be convincing. In the first place, it should be noted that the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra[1] sets only the Mahādivākīrtya Sāman in connection with the Mahāvrata. Professor Hillebrandt meets this objection by regarding the version of the ritual in Āśvalāyana as later than that in Śāṅkhāyana, but Dr. Friedländer[2] and I[3] have adduced a good deal of evidence to prove that the Śāṅkhāyana ritual generally is of a more elaborate and artificial type than that of Āśvalāyana, and that the relation in time of the two Sūtras is the reverse of that accepted by Professor Hillebrandt. It is therefore very difficult to eliminate from the Mahāvrata the Mahādivākīrtya Sāman, which by both Śāṅkhāyana and Āśvalāyana is assigned to the Mahāvrata. Again, there is no evidence whatever for the connection of the Rathantara and the Viṣuvant beyond the improbable and unsupported conjecture that it originally occupied the place of the Mahādivākīrtya. Moreover, the Bṛhat and Mahādivākīrtya cannot be assigned solely to Indra and Sūrya respectively, without the arbitrary elimination of portions of the received forms of these Sāmans as used in this ritual.[4]

Secondly, even if we accepted as true all these hypotheses, and assumed that the Mahāvrata was connected with Indra alone and the Viṣuvant with Sūrya alone, nevertheless we would not be bound to accept the theory that the former must be placed at the Summer solstice. There is no obvious reason why Sūrya should not be celebrated at the Summer solstice as at the Winter solstice, and the wheel rite of Schleswig at the Winter solstice quoted by Professor Hillebrandt may be balanced

[1] viii, 6. The Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxv, 4, on the other hand, mentions that both the Bṛhat and Mahādivākīrtya Sāmans were by some assigned to the Viṣuvant. The Śāṅkhāyana and Aitareya Āraṇyakas recognise both Bṛhat and Rathantara for the Mahāvrata.

[2] In his edition of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, Mahāvrata section, pp. 9 seq.

[3] *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, pp. 30 seq.

[4] Cf. also Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xi, 14, 8; Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, xli, p. xv, n.

by the similar use of a wheel at the Summer solstice at the present day both in France and Germany, a custom which, according to a mediæval writer cited by Frazer,[1] was one of the three great features of the Midsummer ritual. In the case of Indra we can now quote Professor Hillebrandt against himself, for he has in his *Vedische Mythologie*[2] abandoned the idea that Indra's foe, Vṛtra, is a drought demon, and now finds in him the Winter, without, however, giving up his theory of the Mahāvrata. It is not necessary here to discuss in detail how far the view, which converts Indra into a sun-god, is an accurate representation of the facts of the Ṛgveda as they stand.[3] It is sufficient for our purpose to accept the view of Weber that the conflict of the sun and Winter is Indo-European, or at least Indo-Iranian, and that this conflict is inseparably confused and combined with the later and more specially Indian conception—naturally adopted under the climatic conditions of Hindustan—of a conflict between the drought and the thunderer.

The further arguments adduced by Professor Hillebrandt may be dismissed more briefly. The third ground brought forward by him is the fact that the Viṣuvant forms the middle of a period of twenty-one days, and this period may be compared with a period of like duration, apparently dating from the end of November or the beginning of December, of which faint traces are found in German mythology. But no stress can be laid on this argument, for no special significance attaches to the period of twenty-one days in the Vedic ritual—it is merely one of various similar groupings—while the Germanic evidence is not merely very scanty and doubtful, but, if it shows anything, shows that the period lay just before the Winter solstice, whereas the Viṣuvant is preceded by and followed by ten days on either side.

The next argument rests on the fact that according to one theory mentioned in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xix, 2, the Mahāvrata would have fallen in the month Taiṣa. This month derives its name from the asterism Tiṣya, which is equated with the

[1] Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii, 260 seq. [2] iii, 162 seq.
[3] See Bloomfield, *Vedic Religion*, pp. 179 seq.; *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 883.

Avestan Tistrya and that again with Sirius. Sirius represents the heat of Summer, and hence it is deduced that the Mahāvrata must fall in the Summer. But even if we accept the equation of Tistrya and Sirius,[1] which is by no means without phonetic difficulties, there remains the fact that there is no evidence that Tiṣya was ever to the Vedic Indians a Summer month. The asterism Tiṣya in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā [2] holds the same position to the others as Puṣya in the Atharvan [3] list, and the commentators on the passages where Taiṣa as a name of a month is found concur in equating it with Pauṣa, while Professor Hillebrandt himself admits that this was probably already the view of the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa.

It is not necessary to discuss the minor arguments adduced by Professor Hillebrandt,[4] as he naturally lays no stress on the allegorical plays on the Sāmans and on their connection with the length of the day, etc., which he adduces and explains on his theory just as little convincingly as on any other. It remains, however, to be seen whether the actual rites throw any light on the season at which they were held.

The chief characteristic of the rite is the bird shape [5] ascribed to the litany, the Mahad Uktha, as also to the altar and to the sacred fire. Now the bird is undoubtedly the sun-bird, for it is addressed in the ritual [6] by the word *garutman*, 'winged,' which in the Ṛgveda itself denotes the sun-bird.[7] Both the sun (Āditya) and the fire (Agni) receive formal worship, and there can be no doubt of the sun-character of the swing which is set up and pushed from east to west by the priests. Already in the Ṛgveda [8] the sun is described as the golden swing in

[1] Cf. Weber, *Altiran. Sternnamen*, p. 15; Zimmer, *Altind. Leben*, p. 355. Professor Mills kindly informs me that he thinks the identification probable. Cf. also Geigen, *Ostiran Cult.*, p. 708; Roth, *Z.D.M.G.*, xxxiv, 713.

[2] iv, 4, 10, 1. [3] xix, 7, with Lanman's note.

[4] One, from the use of *ekāṣṭakā* as the mother of Indra, he has withdrawn; see *Vedische Mythologie*, iii, 198, n. 2.

[5] So in the certainly older version of the Aitareya; the Śāṅkhāyana presupposes the human form of fire, altar, and hymn; cf. Friedländer, op. cit., p. 10; above, p. 1, n. 2.

[6] Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, i, 8; Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 5, with Sāyaṇa's note.

[7] Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 39. [8] vii, 87, 5.

heaven, and the direction of the motion is extremely significant. Moreover, in one of the formulæ accompanying the bringing of the swing into contact with the ground, occur the words, 'the great hath united with the great,' this being explained as Agni—here clearly in his celestial form—with the earth.[1] Still more significant is a struggle between an Ārya, normally a Vaiśya, and a Śūdra for a round white skin, which is won by the Ārya and used by him to strike down his defeated rival. The old tradition, already known to the Kāṭhaka, equates the skin and the sun,[2] and, like all the other details mentioned, this equation suits admirably the conception of the rite as an attempt to stimulate the sun at the Winter solstice both by worship and by magic. The movement of the swing stimulates its motion; the Ārya rescues it from the hostile powers which threaten to extinguish its light. Neither act is quite so appropriate at the Summer solstice, when the sun's heat is strong and needs no recruiting.

In this connection can also be explained the use of a drum by the priest and of various musical instruments—a long list of names of these instruments is given made up of rare popular words—by women, whose presence and activity are characteristic of the popular character of the ritual. These noises may have been designed, like the gong at Dodona, to drive away evil demons,[3] and to protect at once the sun and the performers of the rite from their onslaught, and the sounds of the musical instruments were reinforced by the shout of the priests. Professor Hillebrandt prefers to regard the use of the drum as an imitation of the thunder, designed to evoke real thunder, but the simpler explanation is here quite adequate.

Nor can any support of Professor Hillebrandt's theory be

[1] Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, i, 5.

[2] See Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 88, n. 4, and Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, xxxiv, 5, cited by Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, iii, 477, which Oldenberg appears to have overlooked. This passage shows clearly that the analysis of *śūdrāryau* as *śūdra* and *arya* is incorrect and strengthens Geldner's view that *arya* never means the Āryan (*Ved. Stud.*, iii, 94–7).

[3] Cf. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*², pp. 164 seq.; Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, pp. 40 seq.; Crooke, *Popular Religion*, pp. 60, 108; Cook, *J.H.S.*, xxii, 4, 20–8; Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, ii, 32.

derived from other parts of the rite. The performance was accompanied by a running commentary of praise and criticism by two persons selected for that purpose. This is probably a priestly refinement, for this feature of the rite is one of the least well authenticated.[1] On the other hand, all the versions agree in mentioning the *brahmacāripuṃścalyoḥ saṃpravāda*, a contest in ritual *αἰσχρολογία* between a hetaera and a Brahmin scholar vowed to chastity. Various theories have been advanced to explain such instances of *αἰσχρολογία*; the simplest[2] perhaps is that it is merely another method of demon-scaring, but the evidence for this view is hardly convincing, and it seems best to regard the ritual here, as in the Thesmophoria,[3] as undoubtedly calculated to promote the fertility of beings and the earth. This view is probably rendered certain by a further custom merely referred to in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka[4] in the terse words *bhūtānāṃ ca maithunam*, and by a singular example of priestly or general moral progress repudiated as *purāṇam utsannam* in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra,[5] but referred to in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā and described fully in the other Sūtra accounts.[6] This rite must be compared with the *ἱερὸς γάμος*[7] of the Greek and Asianic ritual and brought into connection with the symbolic union of earth and sun, the touching of the earth by the swing. Probably originally the rite was one celebrated by two Āryans, the *puṃścalī*, like the Māgadha of Lāṭyāyana, representing a degradation of the rite, and was a solemn ceremony, at once a counterpart of the union of sun and earth, whence sprang fertility for the crops, and a powerful spell to promote human fertility. All this is perfectly

[1] It is noticed in neither of the Ṛgvedic Āraṇyakas, but it occurs in Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vii, 5, 9, 3.

[2] Cf. Campbell, *Ind. Ant.*, xxiv, 263 seq.

[3] Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, iii, 104.

[4] v, 1, 5.

[5] xvii, 6, 2. The sense of *utsanna* is here made clear by the continuation *na kāryam*.

[6] The plural in the Aitareya suggests that the ritual involved the union of more pairs than one, representing the different sides of animal life. The Taittirīya, vii, 5, 9, 4, has only one pair.

[7] I assume that the *ἱερὸς γάμος* is a remnant of a real marriage, not a mere symbolism, but intended to promote fertility as a magic spell. Cf. Farnell, op. cit., i, 184 seq.

compatible with a Midwinter rite, when heat is needed for the earth and there is every reason to stimulate fertility.

It is, however, true that an explanation can be offered of the facts if they are regarded as taking place at Midsummer. Dr. Frazer [1] quotes cases both of May and Midsummer pairs as representatives of the spirit of vegetation in its reproductive capacity, and the drumming might be a thunder-magic, as at Dorpat in Russia.[2] A further support for this theory may be found in a feature of the ritual which has not yet been mentioned. Maidens with water pitchers dance round a fire singing, in one version [3]—'The cows smell pleasantly: here is sweet drink! The cows smell with sweet odour: sweet drink! The cows are mothers of butter: sweet drink! May they increase amongst us: sweet drink! The cows we would have bathe (in water): sweet drink!' As they dance they strike their right thighs with their right hands, or, according to Hiraṇyakeśin, beat the ground with their right feet, and their dance is *pradakṣiṇam*,[4] following the sun's motion. Finally, they cast the contents of their pitchers into the Mārjālīya fire. With such a dance may, of course, be compared the dance of the 'Sweethearts of St. John' and others on St. John's Eve in Sardinia, or the dance of the Oraons and Mundas of Bengal (a non-Aryan people) around the Karma-tree.[5] Nor can there be any doubt that the rite is essentially a rain-spell of a common type, and it is possible that the ceremonial beating of the thighs is a remnant of a more serious effort to expel evil influences and promote fertility.[6] But granting all this, there is still no cogent reason for transferring the time to Midsummer. The rains which it is sought to invoke may, as Professor Oldenberg [7] has pointed out, quite as well be

1 *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*², pp. 208, 209.
2 *Golden Bough*, i, 13.
3 Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 445.
4 See Caland & Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. xxxvii.
5 *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*², pp. 198 seq.; Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, ii, 190.
6 Cf. the rite of the Lupercalia (Warde Fowler, op. cit., p. 311) and the Thesmophoria (Farnell, op. cit., iii, 104); Kāṭhaka, xiii, 10.
7 *Religion des Veda*, p. 445; cf. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, iii, 205; and for the great economic importance of these rains, *Ind. Emp.*, i, 140, 141.

the Winter rains necessary for the production of the Spring crops, which we have independent evidence [1] were already reaped in early Vedic times, and the connection of the sun with rain-spells would seem a most natural conjunction, the combined influence of both heat and rain being essential for the production of crops. Professor Hillebrandt uses, however, the fact that the water is poured over the fire as a piece of evidence in favour of the Midsummer date. In his view the act symbolises the extinction of the burning heat of Summer by the rain of the monsoon, and is a spell to bring down the rains. But this view seems somewhat far-fetched. For it must be noted that *de facto* there is no hint in any of our texts that the fire is extinguished by the water, and, indeed, no one familiar with the ritual would expect that a sacred fire should be so summarily disposed of, so that (unless we assume that the original practice has been obliterated by priestly developments) the magic spell would hardly be successful as a spell, if in fact it fails to accomplish even its proximate purpose, the quenching of the terrestrial fire. If a symbolical explanation must be found, it would seem preferable to take the union of water with the fire as denoting the κρᾶσις of the wet and warm elements to bring forth the harvest. Or, more simply, the rite may be regarded as a water-spell in the dashing of the water over the fire, the fire being chosen as the receptacle simply because it is the natural place in which all offerings are made, and the song of the maidens shows that the water they bear is regarded as more than mere water, as *madhu*, and a suitable drink for the god Āditya, who is clearly intended to drink it, as is shown conclusively, e.g. in the Aitareya version.

So far we have found no trace in the ritual of the most characteristic feature of modern vegetation rituals at Midsummer, the animal or human representation of the corn or vegetation spirit, nor does Professor Hillebrandt seek to find any such phenomena in the Mahāvrata. It is, however, only fair to note the evidence which could be alleged in favour of this view. The Mahāvrata is by no means a bloodless sacrifice. There

[1] Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vii, 2, 10, 1 seq.; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xix, 3, where in Caitra the *sasya* is ready.

fell to be offered either one beast to be sacrificed to Indra and Agni or a batch of eleven, and in either case there is an additional sacrifice of a bull to Indra or to Prajāpati, and in the former case of a goat to Prajāpati.[1] Now at least in some cases the skin of the sacrificial animal was removed and used to form the drum (*bhūmidundubhi*), on which, with the tail of the victim, the priest made solemn music. With this usage may, of course, be compared the legends of the skin of Marsyas and of other sacred skins, like the ægis, collected by Dr. Frazer.[2] But it is clear that the skin may equally well be regarded as the natural means of making a drum, nor need we be anxious to deny that the skin may have seemed particularly effective for its purpose because it had come from an animal which by sacrifice had come into close contact with divinity, and in a sense itself was not without a share in the divine.[3]

More obscure is another rite mentioned in all the sources. To the left of the Āgnīdhra priest were placed two posts on which was hung up as a target a completely round skin, or, according to Lāṭyāyana, two skins, one for the chief archer and the other for any others who were good shots. At one point in the ceremony the king or a Rājput mounted the chariot, and driving round the Vedi pierced with three arrows the skin, leaving the arrows to stick in the skin.

The exact sense of this rite is by no means clear. It may possibly be compared with the Lapp ritual reported by Dr. Frazer.[4] After slaying a bear with ceremonies intended to deprecate the wrath of the ghost and of the bear tribe, they hung its skin on a post and women blindfolded shot arrows at it, a custom comparable with the myth of the death of Balder and the blindness of Hödur, who slew him. But the parallel is hardly clear or cogent. In the Mahāvrata there is no hint of

[1] Also, in the Aitareya, a bull to Viśvakarman. The details vary; cf. Friedländer, op. cit., p. 30.

[2] *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*², pp. 242 seq. For the ægis cf. Farnell, op. cit., i, 100; for the peculiar magic potentialities of the tail—as the home of the vegetation spirit or for other reasons—cf. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, i, 408; ii, 3, 42; Warde Fowler, op. cit., pp. 246, 247.

[3] For other examples of this idea in Vedic religion, cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 938 seq.; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, iii, 7, 8; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, ii, 3, 11.

[4] *Golden Bough*, ii, 360, n. 3.

blindness; the archer is the best bowman available, and the skin is nowhere stated to have been that of the sacrificial animal. On the contrary, it is described by Āpastamba[1] as a 'dry' skin, and further there is no trace in the ritual of the animal being treated as anything more than a mere sacrificial victim on the gift theory of sacrifice, which notoriously is the one represented in the Brāhmaṇa texts as the normal one.[2] If, therefore, there were ever any vegetation spirit in the rite, it has departed without leaving a clear trace of its presence.

The rite, therefore, still remains to be explained. The bow and the three arrows remind us of the ritual of the Rājasūya,[3] in which the king shoots three arrows at the princes of his family as a token of superiority. The similarity of the picture suggests that the act is hostile rather than an act of sympathetic magic; otherwise we might have compared the shooting of the arrows with the custom of the Ojibways in firing fire-tipped arrows to rekindle the expiring light of the sun in an eclipse, or the practice of throwing blazing discs shaped like suns in the air in the Midsummer rites.[4] But there is no hint here of fire-tipped arrows,[5] and it is probably simplest and best to consider that the arrows are used to pierce the sky and bring down the rain. The round shape of the target can hardly be used as an argument against this view, for though round—and, therefore, so far like the sun—it is not claimed to have been white, nor is even its roundness mentioned in most of the authorities, nor indeed is there any difficulty in regarding the sky as circular, since even in the Ṛgveda it is compared to a wheel and to a bowl, while the earth itself, its counterpart, is described as circular.[6] The question, however, still remains why the arrows are not allowed to go right through the skin, and the most plausible answer is perhaps that it was desired to

[1] Cited in Sāyaṇa on Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 1, 5.
[2] Cf. Caland & Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, App. iii. The only rival theory is that of the magic effect of the sacrifice, Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 122 seq.
[3] Hillebrandt, *Vedische Opfer und Zauber*, p. 145.
[4] Frazer, *Golden Bough*, i, 22; ii, 268.
[5] Cf. for their later use in Epic war, Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, xiii, 277, 298.
[6] Macdonell, op. cit., p. 9; Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, ii, 93, n. 2.

keep open the rents in order that the rain might continue to fall; the arrow might be conceived as allowing enough room for the escape of the rain while still remaining in the wound.

The rite is therefore merely a rain-spell, and is perfectly compatible with a Midwinter date for the Mahāvrata. Other parts of the ritual are also designed for the same end, notably the ceremonial washing of the swing,[1] while the burning of the material whence had been formed the seats of the officiating priests is clearly a sun-spell, comparable with the lighting of bonfires at Christmas[2] and at Midsummer. As the swing symbolises the sun, we may see, if we like, in its bathing another symbolism of the fertilising union of sun and water.

It would, of course, be useless to expect the Mahāvrata to have survived in modern India, but it is not uninteresting to note that in the worship of Kṛṣṇa, who unites, it seems most probable, in himself the attributes of sun-god (Viṣṇu) and a vegetation spirit (perhaps non-Aryan), are found, on the 12th and 13th of January, rites including sun and fertility magic, and that, later, on the 14th of the light half of Phālguna, takes place a *dolāyātrā*, in which the image of Kṛṣṇa is swung to and fro.[3] Moreover, in Southern India,[4] long the chief home of Brahmanism, in January, when the sun enters the tropic of Capricorn, there is celebrated the feast of Pongol, in which bonfires are made in every street and lane, and young people leap over the fire or pile on fresh fuel. The fire is an offering to Sūrya or to Agni (the identification is parallel with that of Āditya and Agni in the Vedic rite), and is purposed to awaken him to make glad the earth with his heat and light. The parallel to the Mahāvrata is striking; the solemn dance round the fire of the maidens in the Vedic ritual is parallel with the less formal leap over the fire, and leaves little doubt that we need not see in the Mahāvrata any priestly transformation of a Midsummer rite, but a genuine adoption into the priestly ritual of a popular festival. Nor, indeed, is it likely

1 Aitareya Āraṇyaka, v, 3, 2, with my note.
2 Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*², pp. 254 seq.
3 Cf. Wilson, *Works*, ii, 216 seq., 225 seq.
4 Glover, *J.R.A.S.*, 1870, pp. 96 seq.

that a rite so important as to force its way into the Brahminical ritual, and to cause them to allow women to play so conspicuous a part, could have been artificially altered in date.

We may, therefore, adhere to the view that the Mahāvrata is a ritual of the Winter solstice, and that it combines within itself the characteristics of a spell to procure the heat of the sun and the fall of rain, so as to bring about fertility for the land, while more directly still it is designed to stimulate human and animal productiveness. In view of the early date of the rite—and already in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā and the Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā it is clearly recognised and so cannot be dated later than the eighth century B.C.—it is of considerable interest that it contains no trace of a vegetation spirit such as can be found in ancient Mediterranean rituals, and this fact renders us entitled to be cautious before necessarily assuming that all these vegetation and fertility spells involved the conception of a vegetation spirit, an idea not readily verified in the other Vedic texts. No doubt in the later Hindu religion among its strange characteristics are many which depend on the idea of a vegetation spirit, but in such cases non-Aryan influence is certainly at work, either adding a new aspect of religious thought or bringing into the foreground an aspect which for some reason or another was not prominent in the mass of conceptions which may be termed Vedic religion.[1]

[1] The original authorities are, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, i and v; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, i and ii; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vii, 5, 9 and 10; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, i, 2, 6; Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, xxxiv, 5; Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, v, 5, 6; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xvii and xviii; Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, iii, 10-iv, 3; Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xiii, 3.